FELT KNOWING, TACIT KNOWLEDGE AND CREATIVE PRACTICE:

INSIGHTS FROM ARCHITECTS AND PRIVATE DEVELOPERS IN URBAN SETTINGS

Kate C. McCauley

MA in Human Geography (MU) | MLS (UTS) | BPropEc (UTS)

Department of Geography and Planning,

Macquarie University (MU), Australia

A thesis submitted to Macquarie University (November 2017) in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.).

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

TABLES:

ABSTRACT: FELT KNOWING, TACIT KNOWLEDGE AND CREATIVE PRACTICE:

INSIGHTS FROM ARCHITECTS AND PRIVATE DEVELOPERS IN URBAN SETTINGS

This thesis looks closely at architectural design and private developer practice in relation to public sector urban planning practice. In particular, it focuses on experiential aspects of how practitioners from each of these distinct practice traditions, who work in similar contexts but under different conditions, do what they do. Analysis is undertaken at a particularly fine resolution, exploring the phenomenology of their practices using constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006). This allows the thesis to build a grounded theory in the form of a partial model of practices used by the participants, as they transition back and forth between feeling, thinking and doing in their professional practices.

The research delivers three main findings:

(i) fine resolution practices described in different settings by Gendlin (1996), Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and Walkerden (2005) are echoed in skilful architectural and property developer practice;

(ii) elements of a family of gestures involving problem-solving, designing and negotiating can usefully be delineated in the practices of private developers and architects; and

(iii) there are resonances between the practices of private sector architects and developers, and public sector urban planners (including designers) which open up new possibilities for knowledge sharing and provoking creativity amongst practice traditions affecting urban futures.

These findings are significant because they complement and contribute to recent work in communicative planning. Forester (1989) identified conversational practices that support an understanding of urban planning as communicative (building on the work of Habermas 1984), and identified the importance of conversation – dialogue, debate and deliberation – as a platform for 'making sense together'. This research identifies more interiorly-oriented practices that support creative responses to challenges of urban planning and private development and in integrative ways. The thesis concludes that better understanding how practice operates complements Forester's emphasis on the social aspects of making sense, and also advances the emphasis on democratic process and social justice in communicative planning. Finally, the thesis considers how these findings open new opportunities for developing a teachable model of the microprocesses of practices identified in the mappings of modes of practice presented.

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY:

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Signed: Date: 22 November 2017

Kate C. McCauley
PhD Candidate, Macquarie University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

I wish to express my gratitude to those who have contributed to this thesis by participating, supporting or inspiring me.

I am exceedingly grateful to my primary supervisor, Dr Gregory Walkerden, for his empathic guidance, especially during the difficult analytical phases. His critical insight and encouragement to keep placing one foot in front of the other have been crucial at various stages of this research.

I am indebted to Prof. Richard Howitt, my associate supervisor, who has been a guiding light to me for years. Without his support, I may never have taken this path. I am appreciative of and inspired by his incisive intellect, wisdom and generosity, and to the fruits which have come from our timely conversations and his insightful feedback.

My deepest thanks to my loving partner, Roberto, who has been by my side throughout this journey. His affection, empathy and kindness are a daily inspiration. His selflessness, complemented by his reminders that there is more to life than my thesis, have been crucial in me maintaining (and at times helping me to regain) motivation and stay on track.

My heartfelt appreciation goes to my dad, Bruce, who passed away unexpectedly not long before I started this journey. It is in part because of him that I took on this project. Despite no longer being here, my memories of the times we shared and the ways he cared for me give me strength, soften my heart and help keep me connected when times are tough.

My wholehearted thanks go to other members of my family, including my long-term companion and dog, Billie, who passed away in 2015 and whose Buddha-like presence still shines brightly in my heart, our fun-loving and zealous puppy Peppermint who is an enchanting playmate and often makes me smile, and my mum, Peta, who has, more than anything else, taught me the importance of independence.

A very special thankyou to those who make up the Department of Geography and Planning (especially Dr Claire Colyer for her proofing input) and those in other parts of Macquarie University for giving me the opportunity to carry out this doctoral research and for the many teaching opportunities provided along the way.

To my extraordinary friends, peers and mentors, especially Angie, Evangeline, Jasper, Kimmaree, Laura, Michelle, Nicholas, Ondine, Scott, Stig and Tanya, sincere thanks for the soundbites of wisdom, laughs and patience.

Finally, to each and every one of those who from afar have inspired me with their work and/or approach to life, including but by no means limited to David Bohm, Henri Bortoft, Ludovico Einaudi, Eugene Gendlin, S.N. Goenka, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Sylvie Guillem, Nigel Kennedy, Viktor Schauberger, The Necks, Jalāl ad-Dīn Muhammad Rūmī, Alan W. Watts, a very warm thanks.

1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 RESEARCH CONTEXT

This thesis looks closely at architectural design and private developer practice in relation to public sector urban planning practice. In particular it focuses on experiential aspects of how practitioners from each of these distinct practice traditions, who work in similar contexts although under different conditions, do what they do.

Interest in the practice skills that key players involved in the realisation of built form – in the way urban spaces emerge from early thoughts and ideas about strategic planning, through identification of opportunities to build in ways that are commercially viable, through design and construction – has been longstanding in some quarters. Forester (1989), Healey (1997) and Innes (1995, 1998a, 1998b), for example, have each explored intricacies of public sector planning practice. Their work builds on earlier investigations that include, for example, Schön's (1983, 1987) inquiries into the skilfulness and education of planners and architects, and his celebrated discussions of practicums and coaching. In the architectural literature, there is also a long history of interest in these types of questions. Pallasmaa (2009, 2013), Alexander (1979) and Alexander et al. (1977) have explored the kinds of creative processes that architects employ, in ways that are, amongst other things, designed to evoke these practice skills in architect readers.

The practice of private property developers, however, has been examined much less closely. Most work in that tradition has focused on more formal and/or abstract characterisations of property development processes: developer practice is abstracted in ways that contrast markedly with the experientially rich descriptions one finds in, for example, the work of Forester (1989, 2006) in public planning or Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) in architecture. Starting with careful engagement with skilful architects, this thesis

moves to careful engagement with private developers[1] to build a clearer understanding of practice (i.e. a grounded theory in the form of a model of skilful practices) in creating built urban form from design to construction.

Public sector urban planners (and designers), architects and private developers all play important roles in land use planning and regulation, and the design and delivery of built product. Public planning systems often exercise legitimate authority over private development processes. Urban scale planning outcomes, however, are of course subject to sociopolitical, environmental and economic pressures that come from a variety of sources. As noted by Forester:

> *Pressed for quick recommendations, planners cannot begin lengthy studies. Faced with organizational rivalries, they may justifiably be less than candid about their own plans. What is sensible to do depends on the context one is in, in ordinary life no less than in planning and public administration.* (1989, p. 48)

Notwithstanding the constraints they face, public planners in Western democracies have an important role to play in setting, mediating and negotiating the ground rules for private development potential and processes (Forester 1989). Urban development is composed of a complex, dynamic and often overlapping set of sociomaterial processes (Healey 2004). The interface that exists between public planning, architectural design and property development in the design and delivery of built product implies that looking closely at architectural design and property developer practice would help inform understanding of the context and practice of public sector planning.

Architectural theorists such as Pallasmaa and Alexander offered two distinct but resonant approaches to understanding design as experiential and multisensory.

[1] 'Developers' in this thesis refers to a subset of developers working at the upper-middle and high-end of the property markets. This is appropriate because the focus of this thesis on understanding how higher quality developments can be produced, with a view to making some of the skills relied upon by practitioners better understood and more widely shared.

Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) is particularly sensitive to the fine resolution[2] aspects of first person experientially-oriented design practice while Alexander et al.'s (1977) work on 'pattern languages' tends towards design coding (albeit flexible and evolving) as a means of evoking the bodily-oriented marker of quality design – "the quality without a name" (Alexander 1979).

The urban design literature demonstrates an interest in creative practice and problem-solving, and serves to highlight the importance of architectural design-like skills in public planning as a mediator of market dynamics. But it contains little that draws on analyses of architectural practice or explicates how public planners might leverage such skills.

The work of communicative planning theorists such as Healey, Forester and Innes lays foundations for recognising the value of careful analysis of the creative and design practices of planners as part of the planning and development ecosystems of contemporary cities. This opens the door to fine resolution analyses of public planning practice, but communicative planning discourses primarily focus on the social rather than experiential or intrapersonal aspects of practice.

Research on property development practice, especially that of private developers, has been limited. Coiacetto (2000, 2001), and Guy and Henneberry (2002) carried out coarser resolution analyses of developers and some architects and their decision-making tendencies, but little attention has been paid to detailed analysis of the first person experientially-oriented practice of key private sector players such as architects and developers. There is more to be done in looking closely at private practice, especially the felt, experiential and creative aspects of 'feeling-thinking-doing' design and property development work.

[2] Looking at a 'fine resolution' is akin to viewing something at a high resolution under the microscope as distinct from a low resolution that gives a 'grainier' or coarser image. In this research, 'fine resolution' assists in describing the high resolution lens deployed in unpacking the gestures of problem-solving, designing and negotiating. Within these processes, there are micropocesses to be unpacked, and within those there are nanoprocesses to be unpacked and so on. The terms 'fine resolution' and 'fine grained' are used in the thesis to describe this way of viewing and exploring the subtler qualities of practice.

The research reported in this thesis, then, is founded on the premise that this lack of understanding of the significance of professional practice of individual practitioners' modes of creativity, decision-making and implementation at a fine resolution deserves careful attention. In building an empirically grounded partial model of practices, the thesis offers a window into how public planners, and others associated with or working alongside them, might realise better built urban outcomes in public and private interest terms.[3]

1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM

Much of what public planners do, including writing urban plans and policies, and negotiating with developers and architects, is realised in concrete form in design and delivery processes which are often largely in the hands of the private sector, yet research into private sector practice in relation to public planning is limited. The arguments put forward by communicative planners such as Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997), Forester (1989) and Innes (1995, 1998a, 1998b) have each contributed to understandings of public planning (and private property development) as social processes. Even though in communicative planning the emphasis tends to be on the social aspects of public planning practice (see Forester 1989), the underlying concept that knowing is created through interaction with others (Healey 1992a) implies that knowing can be seen as both socially- and interiorly-oriented, as well as co-creational. That is to suggest that one's knowing is at one and the same time socially and experientially situated.

There is a gap in the planning and associated literatures regarding the intricacies of skilful private sector architectural and developer practice from first person and experiential perspectives (discussed in more detail in Chapter 2).[4] It makes sense then

[3] The concept of a 'partial model of practice' is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3. The essence being that the intricacies of phenomena can be delineated further and further, and so any explication is only ever partial and somewhat incomplete.

[4] 'Skilful' in this thesis is refers to an ability to problem set and solve; the intuitive artistry outside of technical rationality described by Schön (1992, p. 57): "Once we put technical rationality aside, thereby giving up our view of competent practice as an application of knowledge to instrumental decisions, there

to focus on the first person experiencing of property developers and architects in relation to public planning as a way to broaden and deepen understandings of both public planning practice and private development practice and the ways planning commitments are evidenced (or not) in built form. Extending understanding of the intricacies of private sector practice may offer a way for public planners to better appreciate how what they do, for example, planning, policy making and negotiating, can influence private design and delivery processes, and resulting urban outcomes. It may also point to ways that public planners and designers can anticipate and counteract exploitative and/or manipulative private sector behaviour that puts the affected public at risk.[5] This is an important part of democratising public planning practice according to Forester, who states that:

> *Progressive planners… must learn to anticipate misinformation before the fact, when something might still be done to counteract it… The practical problem, then, is not invent new strategies in response to misinformation – such strategies abound. Instead, the planner must be able, as the progressive view suggests, to anticipate and counteract the practical misinformation likely to arise in various organizational and political processes.* (1989, 41)

Communicative planning researchers emphasise the role of public planners as mediators, facilitators and brokers, and do so with an eye to the ethical imperatives that public planners working in democracies are beholden to (see Forester 1989; Healey 1997). The inquiry that follows is an attempt to speak most directly to such interests to specifically address the problem that has motivated this study: the underdeveloped area

is nothing strange about the idea that a kind of knowing is inherent in intelligent action. Common sense admits the category of know-how, and it does not stretch common sense very much to say that the know-how is in the action-that a tightrope walker's know-how, for example, lies in, and is revealed by, the way he takes his trip across the wire, or that a big league pitcher's know-how is in his way of pitching to a batter's weakness, changing his pace, or distributing his energies over the course of a game. There is nothing in common sense to make us say that know-how consists in ideas or plans which we entertain in the mind prior to action. Although we sometimes think before acting, it is also true that in much of the spontaneous behavior of skilful practice we reveal a kind of knowing which does not stem from a prior intellectual operation."

[5] This thesis focuses on the ways architects and property developers do what they do at a fine resolution with a view to improving understanding of these practice disciplines and in urban planning as part of a broader political system which significantly influences property development processes.

of research into private sector development practice at a fine resolution and from first person perspectives which may have important implications for public sector planning.

This research has paid particularly close attention to the skills that architects and developers employ in the design and delivery of built form. The proposition is that by looking closely, new insights about the kinds of practices that shape built form will emerge. It is expected that the lessons that emerge will be of relevance to public planners and urban designers, private architects and developers, and to researchers who take an interest in theory and practice, and in understanding and provoking skilfulness in these practice traditions.

To unpack what 'looking closely' might mean, some related investigations of practice at a fine resolution have been drawn on – in particular, Gendlin's (1996) work on problem-solving that has its roots in an investigation of these types of practices in psychotherapy. Gendlin's (2007) 'focusing' practice centres on helping people heed their evolving 'feel' for their situations. By 'feel' Gendlin means the kind of *felt* understanding of situations that is evident when one looks for words to express something about the world and then finds words that adequately fit. Processes like this involve what he calls a 'felt shift'. What he means by this is evident from examples like revising a draft of a paper. When one arrives at a passage one feels uncomfortable with, and pauses, the feeling of discomfort is informative, even if one does not know at first *why* one feels uncomfortable with the words one is reading. When, after a time, fresh words come that ease the discomfort, one is experiencing what Gendlin describes as a 'felt shift'. According to Gendlin (1996), these kinds of fine resolution processes are fundamental to problem-solving.[6] As Walkerden (2005) identified, Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) found

[6] It is worth underlining that this thesis centres on aspects of experience where the terminology is relatively unstable because a research consensus has not emerged (although the parallels between Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) inter alia, point to the possibility of arriving at this). This means that the language used to explicate the kinds of fine grained processes (or gestures) discussed herein has a provisional character; what the terms point to experientially is what matters. Gendlin (1997a, p. 67) offers the following experiential scaffold: "If the reader is not convinced... he can demonstrate it for himself at any time. Let him simply ask himself what he means by any word or symbol. He will find himself feeling the sense of the meaning. He may explicate it and expand it, but he will never have it

a highly-resonant set of gestures in what she describes as 'the intuitive experience' and which she argues is useful for creative and/or lateral thinking.

That fact that people write more or less skilfully, and with different sensitivities, points to divergent skills at this fine resolution. Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) both show that skills in this kind of thinking can be highly or modestly developed, and that heightened applications of this mode of thinking can be very generative. It seems then, that having a particularly fine grained look at architectural and developer practice might reveal kinds of thinking skills, at a fine resolution, that play important roles in how these practitioners work creatively and solve design problems (see Schön and Wiggins 1992) and with micropolitics of development (see Forester 1989). Exploration of first person and interiorly-oriented skills at this fine resolution, following Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999), might complement research into public sector urban planning and urban design, architecture and development that focuses more on social skills and on algorithmic aspects of the problems they face.

It was anticipated that this fine grained investigation could complement or at least extend the communicative work undertaken by Forester (1989), Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997), Innes (1995, 1998a, 1998b) and others by providing a potentially pedagogically useful cross-disciplinary analysis of private sector, first person and experientially-oriented perspectives on how skill plays out in practice. By looking closely at what private developers and the architects who often work for them do, the picture of the practice skills that are important for the realisation of built form and planning commitments could be expanded significantly.

The research questions addressed in this thesis centre on how skilful architects and property developers carry out processes of design and delivery at a fine resolution close to the creation of meaning to understand how skilfulness takes place experientially.

---

except as a felt sense... To some extent he can have the meaning with or without the proper symbols. He cannot have the meaning without the sensed feel of it".

Researchers interested in public planning practice as interactive, co-generative and political (communicative planners such as Forester 1989; Healey 1992a, 1992b, 1997; Innes 1995, 1998a, 1998b), and/or interested in the more experiential aspects of architectural design or private developer practice (Coiacetto 2000, 2001; Pallasmaa 2009, 2013) are likely to see value in such a focus as a way to better understand processes which significantly influence the realisation of quality urban outcomes and planning commitments. This, however, relies on an appreciation that the ways public planning policies, plans and practice are received by architects and developers matters to the overall quality of urban outcomes.

This inquiry is novel in two main ways. Firstly, it looks closely – a level below what is usually examined – at skilful private sector practice from a first person and experientially-oriented perspective and with a view to finding lessons for the private and public sectors. Secondly, the two practice traditions under study sit alongside public urban planning and design, and this is used to explore the resonances and contrasts between them. The communicative planning literature emphasises that multiple stakeholders are involved in the dialogue, debate and negotiation that leads to built form and delivers (or does not) on public planning commitments. It is not usual to look at the diversity of practices that are combined in these meetings alongside each other – public planners, urban designers, architects, developers amongst others, and to date little attention has been given to the complexity and skill of practices employed by various key private sector stakeholders such as developers.

1.3 THE RESEARCH

The work laid out in the chapters that follow move this agenda forward by (i) illustrating families of core practice skills that architects and developers each rely on; (ii) showing how the skills that each of these groups of professionals employ are resonant of each other's, whilst contrasting in interesting ways, and (iii) identifying ways in which skills that are at the core of architectural and developer practice can contribute to the improvement of public planning practice traditions.

The finer grained and experientially-oriented findings of this research into skilful practice have particular implications for the education of property developers, architects, public planners and urban designers, but also speak to the characterisation of these practices in ways that will interest researchers in these traditions including communicative planning researchers. I have a specific interest in the development of more creative approaches to professional practice, in a way resonant of the work of Forester (1989) and Healey (1997) and others (Pallasmaa 2009, 2013; Schön 1983, 1987; Schön and Wiggins 1992; Walkerden 2005) and so have focused on the work of highly-skilled practitioners, using interviews with leading practitioners in the property development space in Australia as the foundation for the work.

The participants were selected primarily on the basis of their professional standing, and, secondarily, with a preference for those with whom I had a professional relationship, as this made it easier to build rapport, which was necessary for enquiring into the intricacies of their practice. The sample was deliberately shaped to select interviewees who would assist with answering the research questions. Given the focus of Gendlin(1996), Petitmengin-Peugot (1996) and Walkerden's (2005) on eliciting fine grained aspects of skilful practice, and the emphasis here on selecting skilled practitioners to interview, it is likely that the sample is skewed towards practitioners who make more use of skills heeding a felt experience of meaning. If the research questions were centred on describing the range of professional practice, this selection would constitute a bias, however the goal here is to elicit the details of skilful practice, in part because there are pedagogical aspirations informing the research questions. From the perspective of this particular research interest, the sample chosen is purposive, not biased.

The participants are developers and architects typically with high industry profiles and with many years as leaders in their respective fields. They are well-regarded contributors to quality built environments, i.e. quality in this case referring primarily to delivering on key stakeholder needs, including those of property market players, as opposed to delivering on a broader agenda of social justice, democracy and/or sustainability.

Although the demand for green buildings and ecologically sensitive design (ESD) initiatives is increasing in some segments of the market, it is important to recognise that quality in the private sector still equates to meeting dynamic property market demands and that the architects interviewed here work in service to developers. The participants had various common attributes, each having (i) seniority in their organisation, (ii) demonstrated commercial success, (iii) worked mostly at the upper-end of the market in terms of cost and liveability, and (iv) peer recognition as the recipients of industry awards.[7]

Problem-solving, design and negotiation are critical aspects of skilful architectural and private developer practice as architects and developers seek new building designs which adequately represent the interests of various key stakeholders, and then coalesce the resources to deliver it. Zooming in on architectural and private developer practice in this inquiry was designed to elicit a number of insights for (communicative) planners and those interested in the finer grained first person and experientially-oriented aspects of these two practice traditions. Looking closely at architectural practice as 'problem-solving' and 'designing' uncovered aspects of how architects transition from idea to detailed documentation in plan form (Chapter 4). Looking at private developer practice at a similar resolution as 'problem-solving', 'designing' and 'negotiating' uncovered some of the skills developers rely on in order to deliver built product, and some resonances between architectural and developer practice (Chapter 5).

The research was designed to address questions regarding the kinds of 'gestures' (Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) architects and private developers rely on in their professional lives, to uncover the ways in which architects and private developers rely

[7] Participants were chosen on the basis that they met each of the abovementioned characteristics. Long term leadership and/or executive presence coupled with multiple awards at project and individual scales qualified the participants as 'skilful' from the perspective of industry peers. Substantial involvement in the design, management and/or delivery of commercially successful projects pitched at the upper-middle and/or high-end of the market was also a requirement of participation and added another qualification of 'skilfulness'.

on the 'felt sense' (Gendlin 1996) to carry property development projects forward.[8] The overarching intent was to present the findings in a way that speaks to communicative planning and urban design, and to the property development literature where it is a very marked contrast, and to the architectural literature, where it provides insight into processes of architectural design thinking that in some respect is considerably finer grained than most investigations of architectural practice (including Pallasmaa 2009, 2013).

Perhaps the most notable qualification to this is that, in some ways, the work is resonant of Christopher Alexander's inquiry into architectural practice, *The Timeless Way of Building* (1979), however, Alexander's portrait of architectural practice is one that is largely articulated at a great remove from other traditions of research into architectural practice. It was written more as a manual for practitioners, albeit a profound one in a number of ways, than as an explicit engagement with architectural theory.

The goal here is somewhat different. It is to investigate these practices in a way that speaks to certain research traditions and in particular, to relations with fine grained phenomenologically sensitive research like Gendlin's (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot's (1999), on the one hand, which is directed more towards practitioners' ways of working with themselves, and the more socially- oriented work of communicative planning theorists such as Forester (1989), Healey (1997) and Innes (1995, 1998a). As demonstrated in the following pages, there are opportunities to make interesting contributions by creating links between what are typically considered distinct traditions of inquiry.

[8] 'Gesture' in this thesis refers to a fine grained inner or interiorly-oriented process which helps explicate how certain practitioners do what they do. That is, how they follow, foster and support problem-setting, problem-solving and decision making. The notion of 'gesture' as it is relied on here was discussed at length by Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and similarly by Gendlin (1996). The use of 'gesture' in this thesis is clarified further in Section 3.2.3.

1.3.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions are oriented from an overarching interest in the kinds of 'gestures' (Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) that skilful architects and private developers rely on during the design and delivery of built product. The research questions are:

(i) what kinds of gestures shape skilful architectural and private developer practice at a fine resolution – that is, close to the creation of meaning;
(ii) what kinds of roles does heeding a felt and bodily-oriented sense (Gendlin 1997a) play in such practice traditions, particularly in instances of problem-solving, designing and negotiating;
(iii) how do these gestures (and other insights that emerge from the data) speak to the research interests of the relevant communicative planning, urban design, property development and architectural literatures?

1.3.2 METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

While Chapter 3 offers a detailed account of the methods used in this research, the broad approach adopted here is informed by Nicolini's (2012) investigation of ways in which practices can be researched. He pays particular attention to the ways in which Wittgenstein's (1953, 1969) and Heidegger's (1996) re-imaginations of what practice is, and of the importance of understanding it, have stimulated interest in the intricacy and lived experiencing of practitioners. Nicolini's conclusions, from an extensive survey of approaches to research in practices which includes Bourdieu (1990), Giddens (1984), Heidegger (1996), Mintzberg (1973), Schatzki (2001), Wittgenstein (1953), are that:

(i) there is no consensus on how practices should be investigated, but
(ii) there is considerable wisdom in supporting multiple kinds of inquiry into practice, on the basis that this will foreground different aspects of practice to allow a richer picture of practice to emerge.

This resonates with Forester's work, which has drawn on phenomenological approaches, critical theory and ethnography (Forester 2015).

Nicolini's (2012) eclecticism and encouragement of diversity provides a warrant for a relatively fine grained investigation of practices in a way that is resonant of Gendlin's (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot's (1999). Walkerden (2005) has shown that this approach can be fruitful when one enquires into environmental management practice and other practice traditions.

The methods relied on in this project specifically come from constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006) which is a later development within the grounded theory tradition that explicitly affirms bringing established frames of reference and theory into the process of interpreting and recognising patterns within rich qualitative data. Glaser and Strauss’ (2008) initial formulation of grounded theory emphasised working inductively, and in a way naïvely, with limited use of existing theory in order to be open to novel theoretical insights that emerge from the data. Charmaz (2006) (amongst others) has been moved to make the dialogue between existing theory and new data from which theory might be built more internal to the process of qualitative research. In a way, this can be seen as embracing a collective version of the emphasis that Glaser and Strauss (2008) placed on gradually elaborating theory via theoretical sampling whose underlying logic is to expand the set of cases that one examines as one builds a theory – in this case a model – of skilful practice.

Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) provide insights into fine grained processes for thinking intuitively that were particularly useful in framing how this research engaged with data that speaks richly to the practices that skilful developers and architects rely on. Data was collected via semi-structured interviews with skilful architects, private developers, project financiers (credit and risk) and senior public officials with planning responsibilities. Phenomenology (Van Manen 2014) and practice theory (Nicolini 2012) were used as methodological frames while constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006) was relied on for analytical guidance.

1.3.3 POSITIONALITY

I came to this research after more than a decade working as a development manager in the private and public sectors, primarily in Sydney, Australia. I have extensive experience across all phases of property development from site acquisitions and masterplanning through design development to practical completion, and have worked closely with a variety of specialist consultants and public sector officials. Over the course of my professional life and studies, I have been interested in why so much of what is realised on the ground demonstrates little care for shorter- and longer-term consequences on the more vulnerable and less powerful members of society (including nonhuman living systems).

Broadly, my interest is in eliciting and understanding some of the skilful ways in which the built environment emerges from the crossing of diverse practice traditions and sectoral divisions. My research interest lies primarily in understanding the ways practice shapes urban outcomes and how such practices might be shifted in helpful ways.[9] I have a strong ethical stance in regard to the responsibility of individuals and organisations to improve the quality of built environments and their impact on society more broadly. I believe humans have an obligation to tread lightly on the planet and pay attention to ways they can improve process and process outcomes, in terms of felt experiencing and also broader economic, social, environmental and political impacts. When I talk about quality, I tend to give primacy to the ways buildings and natural environments are experienced, as I believe this to be important to how built forms function in society. From a wider and longer-term perspective, I would like to see more focus given to the ways enhancing such experiencing might have flow on affects to the functioning of built environments in society.

[9] It is important to note that the thesis is about the second of these, but not the first. This thesis does not, for instance, look at how skilful and unskilful use of the gestures and practices described lead to better and worse built outcomes from diverse stakeholders' perspectives.

I am particularly curious about what goes on at the interface between public sector planning, urban design and private property development because from experience I know that being on either side can, despite best efforts, be frustrating and result in lost opportunities with undesirable impacts in the longer term. There are other times when transitioning between planning, design and delivery can be smoother and more rewarding. One thing is certain, meeting the needs of various key stakeholders involved in urban development more broadly is a complex and difficult task. Regardless of where I have been positioned (within public or private spheres), I have resisted notions of blame or absolute power, and have been more interested in questions of what really underpins projects that work better than others. In asking such questions, I have turned my attention to individual practice as an important contributor to co-creating social change and the improvement of built product.

1.3.4 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

The six chapters that follow propose that felt knowing, tacit knowledge and creative practice are integral to the practices of skilful architects, developers and planners in urban settings.

Chapter 2 consists of a literature review spanning resonant aspects of the architectural design, urban design (including some cross-disciplinary research), communicative planning and property development literatures. The literature discussed (Chapter 2) illustrates the importance of understanding public planning practice at a fine resolution and shows that to date there has been little research that looks at what lessons might be drawn from private sector practitioners, such as architects and private developers, for a public planning audience.

Chapter 3 focuses on methodological framing and research methods and argues the appropriateness of a practice and phenomenologically sensitive orientation (Nicolini 2012; Todres 2007; Van Manen 2014,) built on constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006). It also discusses the ways Gendlin's (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot's (1999) felt

and embodied frames for understanding problem-solving were employed in the data analysis, and the broader analytical frameworks which emerged from analysis and assisted in communicating the findings.

Chapters 4 and 5 present the findings of analysis of architectural and private developer practice respectively. They are presented as a discussion of 'gestures' (Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) and 'metaprocesses' (which are defined in Chapter 3 and also in Appendix 1: Glossary of Technical Terms of the Model of Practices), and rely on quotes from the interview data to illustrate the existence of such creative skills in the respective fields of architectural design and property development. Three main findings emerged from the data:

(i) fine grained gestures described in different settings by Gendlin (1996), Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and Walkerden (2005) are echoed in skilful architectural and property developer practice;

(ii) elements of a family of gestures involving problem-solving, designing and negotiating can usefully be delineated in the practices of private developers and architects; and

(iii) there are resonances between the practices of private sector architects and developers, and public sector urban planners which open up new possibilities for knowledge sharing and provoking creativity amongst practice traditions affecting urban futures.

Chapter 6 is a discussion of the implications and significance of the findings in relation to public sector planning practice. It begins with a broad fine grained characterisation of architectural and property developer practice. This is followed by a section each on what a 'metaprocess of designing' (and a 'metaprocess of problem-solving') and a 'metaprocess of negotiating' (and a 'metaprocess of problem-solving') might mean for public planning practice. This is followed by a discussion of the significance of the findings in relation to the urban planning and design, architectural, and property development literatures.

Chapter 7 returns to the research objectives and questions and offers conclusions as to the significance of the thesis as a whole in relation to the communicative planning and property development literatures. It also points to further research which may carry this work forward, in terms of theory and practice.

2: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 AN OUTLINE OF THE RELEVANT DISCOURSES

This chapter reviews the literatures relevant to the research problem described in Chapter 1, identifying four broad academic themes. The first is a body of literature that considers architectural design. The second is work considering creativity in design and urban planning, often at the scale of whole cities or larger urban regions. The third is the discourse on communicative planning that emerged from the work of urban theorists in Europe in the 1980s. The fourth is academic discussion of property development. The review of these literatures helped to clarify the purpose of this research, and to an extent hone in on appropriate methodologies to enable a contribution to understandings of architectural and private developer practice.

2.1.1 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PRACTICE

Theoretical insights in the architectural literature that explore the significance of the human body in designing and encountering built form, notions of a synthetic, evolving and highly creative thinking-feeling process and sensitivities to phenomenological methods have all influenced the design and methodology of the research project. There are several fine resolution and experientially-oriented inquiries into architects' practice of designing. The most resonant with the issues raised in this thesis are the fine resolution and interiorly-oriented works of Pallasmaa (2009, 2013), Alexander et al. (1977) and Alexander (1979). These argue that emphasis on aesthetics in the world of architecture and design has been to the detriment and backgrounding of haptic and/or bodily experiencing. Alexander et al. (1977) celebrated 'pattern languages' and proposed "the quality without a name" (Alexander 1979), that provides an alternative attitude (including 253 architectural patterns or design codes which form a language) and gives primacy to the experiencing of those who will inhabit the built space as a way to improve design processes and process outcomes. 'The quality without a name',

discussed in more detail later in this chapter, plays a central role for Alexander in defining what it is about certain forms that captures the attention of the people and evokes inspiration across the ages. 'The quality without a name' comes as a somatosensory or bodily-oriented sense of 'aliveness' or 'wholeness' for those encountering quality built form, and through careful attention of the designer to geometric relationships or architectural patterns (Alexander 1979). Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) speaks of something resonant as the 'touching' experience of architecture and points critically to the dominant and obscuring role of vision in the quality of contemporary architectural design work. In contrast to Alexander et al.'s (1977) pattern languages, Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) draws on his experience as an architect and extends his inquiry into the first person-oriented, felt and experiential aspects of architectural practice as a means to provoke bodily sensitivity in practice. These experiential accounts of design work, which emphasise the nuanced and interiorly-oriented character of creative practice, are important as illustrations of a felt sensitivity in the literature on architectural practice.

2.1.2 CREATIVE AND DESIGN PRACTICE IN PLANNING

Public sector urban design is an important aspect of the public planning process which, done well, contributes to the overall quality of urban development processes and outcomes. Lynch's (1960) seminal work on 'imageability' is a guide for the development of cities which represent, engage and evoke a sense of involvement or interaction:

> *A highly imageable (apparent, legible, or visible) city in this peculiar sense would seem well formed, distinct, remarkable; it would invite the eye to greater attention and participation. The sensuous grasp upon such surroundings would not merely be simplified, but also extended and deepened.* (1960, p. 10)

Critically, in this work, Lynch emphasises the reciprocity between observer and observed, and between one's inner learning process and the built environment within which one finds oneself. 'Imageability' in this case is not "something fixed, limited, precise, unified, or regularly ordered, although it may sometimes have these qualities"

(p. 10). It is a felt in a bodily way and resonant of Alexander's (1979) 'the quality without a name' and Pallasmaa's (2009, 2013) 'touching' engagement with built form. It serves as a marker of sensitive and experientially-oriented design.

Sternberg (2000), as part of his call for an integrative theory of urban design, complements the work of Lynch (1960) and argues that the role of public urban designers is to attend to the aspects of design that are neglected by property markets and to what would otherwise result in poor urban outcomes:

> *Urban form is a noncommodifiable resource. Relation and proportion at the urban scale cannot arise through the impersonal mechanism of the market; they must be wilfully brought into existence through planning — through a design intelligence exercised on the collective behalf.* (Sternberg 2000, 271)

That is to say that it is the role of public sector urban designers to address what would otherwise result in the realisation of built product serving a narrow set of private interests. Public urban designers play an important design role in the mediation of the public interest in built product across the public-private boundaries set out by property rights. As Sternberg (2000, 275) notes:

> *The urban designer's task is distinct from that of the architect (one working on a single property) because form, legibility, vitality, meaning, and comfort each act on observers across property lines and across the public-private divide.*

Since the 1990s, Albrechts (2005, 2015), Madanipour (1997), Sternberg (2000) and Higgins and Morgan (2000) have demonstrated an interest in unpacking urban design processes at a fine resolution. Those with a specific focus on explicating creativity and problem-solving processes in urban design, such as Albrechts (2005, 2015) and Higgins and Morgan (2000), have concentrated mainly on how to reveal and provoke such processes in public sector contexts, often whilst acknowledging parallels in character with architectural design work. Both Albrechts (2005) and Higgins and Morgan (2000) concluded that such skills are teachable. This suggests that focusing on the intricacies of

how architects design in private practice might provide insights into how public sector urban planners and designers might facilitate better integration of public planning aspirations across such boundaries.

2.1.3 COMMUNICATIVE PLANNING

Forester (1989), Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997) and Innes (1995, 1998a, 1998b) have made substantial contributions to understanding public sector planning and decision-making processes. These have been collectively referred to as communicative, collaborative and/or deliberative planning theory. They seek to provoke critical responses from public planners in ways that embed distinguishing characteristics of democracy and inclusivity into urban governance, paying careful attention to the qualities of interactions in public planning and planners' responsibility to hear, speak and practice in the public interest (Healey 2003). From a communicative planning standpoint, experiencing, meaning, knowing and understanding are co-constructed. That is, urban planning practice is understood as necessarily deeply social, interactive and evolving (Healey 1992a).[10] Focusing on public planning as interactive, communicative planning theorists such as Forester, Healey and Innes lean towards understandings of public planning as co-created through dialogue, debate and negotiation, and generally communicative acts (i.e. verbal and nonverbal gestures). Public planning process outcomes such as the realisation or not of urban form in public interest terms are, from a communicative perspective, socially-constructed – co-created and co-constituted – through experiencing and the resulting generation of meaning. As Healey describes:

[10] Healey (1992a, pp. 144-156) describes communicative planning broadly as involving: (i) an interactive and interpretive process; (ii) multifarious and fluid discourse communities; (iii) methods of respectful interpersonal discussion within and between discursive communities; (iv) invention and the mediation of conflict and struggle; (v) diverse dimensions of knowing, understanding, appreciating, experiencing and judging; (vi) a reflexive and critical process of argumentation; (vii) all interested in parties in discourse, debate and the generation of possibilities; (viii) the sharing of interests and knowledge, and the generation of understanding between parties; (ix) the potential to transform material conditions and established power relations through critique, demystification and argumentation; (x) the generation of new possibilities and pathways to achieve planning objectives by participants.

> *We may shift our ideas, learn from each other, adapt to each other, 'act in the world' together. Systems of meaning or frames of reference shift and evolve in response to such encounters.* (Healey 1992a, 152)

A core aspect of the communicative planning agenda is about finding ways to understand and evaluate qualitative communicative dynamics (Healey 2003). Communicative planning and this focus on interaction points to the value of fine resolution analysis as a means to understanding how knowing, meaning and consciousness come to influence practice and decision-making processes.[11] Research into communicative planning theory concentrates on the finer grained aspects of public planning practice and attends to the interactive qualities often with a view to improving the quality of such processes and the resulting process outcomes. This focus implies that those researchers in some kind of alignment with communicative planning would likely find value in the analysis of practice at a finer resolution than that uncovered by those such as Healey, Forester and Innes, for example, and oriented from private sector perspectives as is explored in this thesis.

2.1.4 PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT

Private property development practice, and more specifically private developer practice, is relevant to communicative planning's perspective on democratising planning processes and co-creating inclusive and engaged urban futures. There has been quite a bit of work on models of the property development process, including identification of 'event sequence models' (Healey 1991), 'agency models' (Healey 1991), 'production-based approaches' (Gore and Nicholson 1991) and 'institutional models' (Ball 1998). These contributions have been useful in expanding understandings of development from different theoretical and methodological perspectives. Coiacetto (2000, 2001) and

[11] Communicative, collaborative and deliberative planning refer here to planning as participatory democratic process intent on promoting social justice and environmental responsibility through dialogue and debate. The rejection of Habermas' communicative rationality as an ideal of undistorted communication (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998, Mouffe 2000) whilst important is not a central concern as this thesis foregrounds communicative planning as an interactive process of mediation (Healey 1992a), and looks closely at the ways skilful practitioners recognise and push up against material constraints opportunities in an attempt resolve problems and find a way to deliver on commitments.

Guy and Henneberry (2002) have focused on the behaviours and decision-making tendencies of private developers. Interestingly their contributions are not nearly as fine grained as the experientially-oriented first person accounts of architectural design practice discussed by Pallasmaa (2009, 2013). Indeed, little attention has been paid to the finer grained first person characteristics of either private developer and/or architectural practice seen in the communicative planning literature, and even less to the experientially-oriented aspects of practice discussed by those such as Pallasmaa (2009, 2013).

2.1.5 FINE GRAINED ANALYSES OF PRACTICE

In the discourse on architectural design practice, one finds some important elements of first person-oriented discussions of the lived and experiential aspects of professional practice. Theories which look at architectural practice at a fine resolution are of particular relevance here as a means to unpacking how architects go about the design and delivery of built product. The works of note in the architectural tradition and discussed in this chapter include Alexander (1979), Cuff (1992) and Pallasmaa (2009, 2013).

There is also some literature on urban design and planning practice that emphasises creative practice and problem-solving as critical to public sector planning, and which is of particular relevance here. These works draw attention to the kinds of practice skills which will be brought into focus in the empirical chapters (Chapters 4, 5 and 6) and include Albrechts (2005, 2015), Madanipour (1997), Sternberg (2000) and Higgins and Morgan (2000).

The property development literature contains relevant studies which look at the behaviours and perspectives of private property developers. Studies such as Coacietto (2000, 2001) and Guy and Henneberry (2002) pay attention to private developer practice and offer insights into the kinds of forces which significantly shape how built product is

realised on the ground and in the hands of the private sector, although they do not do so at the level of detail undertaken in this research.

The findings from this research offer important additional threads to communicative planning theory which focuses on the interactive and co-creative character of planning practices of debate, dialogue and negotiation. This inquiry is attentive to interactive qualities of urban planning and development practice at a finer resolution than existing work on communicative planning and importantly, from experientially-oriented private sector perspectives. This research offers to expand most obviously on the seminal works of those such as Forester (1989), Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997) and Innes (1995, 1998a), which primarily considered the social aspects of planning practice from public sector perspectives, by drawing attention to first person, interiorly- and experientially-oriented aspects of private architectural design and developer practice.

It is, however, in the work of Gendlin (1996), Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and Walkerden (2005, 2009), that the most useful foundations for careful and fine grained analysis of practice – especially creative practice and problem-solving as experiential, embodied and lived – can be found.

2.2 FINE GRAINED INQUIRIES INTO PRACTICE

A body of work that makes a fundamental contribution to this research is the fine grained inquiry into ways of thinking and problem-solving illustrated by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999). Walkerden (2005) has shown that there are marked resonances between Gendlin's and Petitmengin-Peugeot's research, and that the kinds of microprocesses that each describes have considerable relevance to characterising professional practice in environmental management and land-use planning.[12] Walkerden (2005) makes important links between their work and traditions of research

[12] Refer to TABLE 4.1 (p. 117) of this thesis which details the theoretical framework relied upon during data analysis.

into reflective practice (most notably Schön 1983 and 1987) which in turn reveal associations to more socially-oriented characterisations of public planning practice (such as seen in the communicative planning tradition and the works of Forester 1989; Healey 1992a, 1992b, 1997; Innes 1995, 1998a). This section of the literature review shows that it is possible to inquire into fine grained practice in ways that are illuminating from the perspective of characterising how people do what they do. It argues that research in this area can be stimulating for practice (Hendricks 2001) — by opening up possibilities for problem setting and solving — and shows how it can be generative for development of, and education within, practice traditions (see also Walkerden 2009) and also for theory (see also Gendlin 1997a).

Walkerden (2009) makes three key points supporting the notion that felt processes underpin skilfulness. These are that:

(i) skilful practice is highly-reliant on felt modes of thinking that are not particularly well-explicated;
(ii) when one allows one's felt sense of what to do next to play a central role in one's thinking, practice becomes more astute and creative; and
(iii) such a skill – of orienting from felt understanding/meaning as opposed to already explicated theories or ways of doing – can be taught (Hendricks 2001).

Building on the works of Schön (1983 and 1987) and Gendlin (1997a, 1997b), Walkerden (2009) makes the case that tacit or implicit knowing is central to skilful practice. He lays out a 'basic experimental method', outlined below, as a means to describing the steps involved in such practice. Practitioners (Walkerden 2009, p. 252):

1. orient themselves in their work situations, developing a sense of what is at stake and what step/s they should take;
2. "reflect on where they are coming from as they approach professional practice in their situation… articulating their sense of the situation" and of where they are (and/or should be) headed;

3. practice "in ways that make sense to them as their understanding and situations evolve"; and
4. "reflect on where they are coming from now, and how that carries forward where they were coming from".

The notion that practice becomes more astute and creative when one heeds the felt sense of a situation or problem, and allows this to inform the next step (as suggested in point (ii) above) is supported by the following observations (Walkerden 2009, p. 253):

> *Our sense of where we are and where we are headed is inherently holistic. We can 'feel' it before we say it (more accurately, before we speak from it), and what we 'feel' is a sense of 'the whole' of what is at stake.*
>
> *It is inherently open. Explicitly contemplating what may occur is a special case, not something inherent in action. We enter into situations with a kind of openness to what may occur, . . . the kind of openness we have as we read this paper. As we read, we are open to, poised for, being "carried forward" by what we read next. We imply it making sense. This kind of openness to what may come next is paradigmatic.*
>
> *Our sense of what is at stake is inherently creative. When we are lost for words, slowing down and allowing our sense of what's occurring to lead us can help us find new words. When someone needs us to explain something again, our sense of what we wanted to say lets us speak again in different terms.*

This is a subtle but marked shift in focus from a tendency more broadly to look at practice as a set of actions taken by practitioners, to looking at practice by explicating practitioners' lived experiencing of the meaning[13] of their situations. This is important because:

[13] Meaning here is defined according to Gendlin who states that: "Besides the logical dimension and the operational dimension of knowledge, there is also a directly felt, experiential dimension. Meaning is not only about things and it is not only a certain logical structure, but it also involves felt experiencing. Any concept, thing, or behaviour is meaningful only as some noise, thing, or event interacts with felt experiencing. Meanings are formed and had through an interaction between experiencing and symbols or things." (1997a, p. 1)

> *Practitioners' 'feel' for what is at stake is inordinately richer than what they do. Their feel for what is at stake is grounded in a sense of what may be at stake, that is in sensitivity to a wide range of possibilities that may be relevant to practice situations of a given kind.* (Walkerden 2009, p. 254)

Similarly, Gendlin (1997a, p. 16) argues that "a vital characteristic of experiencing: any datum of experiencing – any aspect of it, no matter how finely specified – can be symbolised and interpreted *further and further*, so that it can guide us to many, many more symbolizations. We can endlessly "differentiate" it further. We can synthesize endless numbers of meaning in it." (1997a, p. 16) Additionally, Gendlin argues that experiencing is a continual aspect of human living and central to what it means to be alive. Experiencing is the constant, underlying and intricate phenomena that exists inwardly in a felt way (1997a, p. 15).

It may seem obvious to suggest that experiencing underpins all living and that any aspect of experiencing can be differentiated further but it is profound – this perspective opens up possibilities for the carrying forward practice. Conceptually one may, if one chooses and knows how to be sensitive to felt experiencing of one's body, explicate any facet of lived experiencing in greater and greater definition. Inquiring into the intricacies of another's practice by asking practitioners to explicate their own felt bodily processes, is an appropriate and legitimate way to understand and encourage understanding of what goes on interiorly — at the border zone between tacit and explicit knowledge — as one goes about experiencing, symbolising and practicing.

Walkerden (2009) also draws attention to two possibilities for practitioners to develop such a skill (as suggested in point (iii) above). The first being to notice one's own process "via reflection-in-action, [and] adapting it so that one is consistently checking with one's feel for what is at stake as one explicates it" (Walkerden 2009, p. 257); the second is to formally train in such skills. Walkerden's (2009) explication of the phenomenon of 'sensibilities' that Gendlin has not observed, as such, is a useful extension of his work. The experiential checks described (Walkerden 2009) are helpful in providing a way for readers to test the theoretical foundations of the 'felt sense' for themselves.

So far there is little research seeking to explicate the very fine grained felt aspects of skilful practice within the urban planning arena. Walkerden (2005) has shown, in particular, that Schön found it difficult to characterise the fine grained processes that he described as "reflection-in-action" (Schön 1983). As Walkerden notes, Schön talks about reflection-in-action as artistic and intuitive, and while he talks in a way that is resonant of Gendlin's (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot's (1999) concerns for the 'feel' that practitioners rely on, he does not develop an analytical framework, nor does he employ fine resolution methods of reflective practice that are fit for the purpose of differentiating and explicating what is involved in these kinds of microprocesses. Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) do, and that is a major reason their work has particular relevance to the characterisation of public planning and related architectural design and developer practice.[14] The interest here in Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) centres on their analytical approaches to the study of intricacy and in particular, how gestures function in skilful practice.

As Walkerden (2005) points out, whilst communicative planning researchers often pay close attention to the social aspects of public planning practice (see Forester 1989; Healey 1992a, 1992b, 1997; Innes 1995, 1998a, 1998b), the more interiorly-oriented and bodily aspects of practice are not well explicated. Gendlin (1996) pays extremely close attention to the intrapersonal aspects of communication but much less attention to the social in a way that is not helpful for professional practice situations. There are microprocesses to do with heeding one's 'feel' for urban development problems that very likely play an influential role in the planning, design and/or delivery of built product. There are various examples which discuss in some detail the potential of such felt experience skills, and their promise in promoting creativity, problem-solving and innovation both within and outside of urban planning practice (Gendlin 1997a, 1996; Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999; Walkerden 2005, 2009). This tranche of skills has the

[14] Refer to TABLE 4.1 (p. 117) of this thesis which details the theoretical framework relied upon during data analysis.

potential to encourage relatively holistic thinking – that is, a more intricate sense of the whole of a situation – and creative practice, and plays a central role in skilful design practice more generally (see Walkerden 2005, 2009). This is perhaps not surprising when one considers Gendlin's (1997a, p. 149) description of coming to terms with the felt sense as a highly-creative process. In his words:

> *felt meaning is simply our having of the meaning of a given symbolization… The vast creative possibilities that felt meaning gives concern further symbolization… The felt meaning of any symbolization is still capable of further and different symbolization…*

Paying close attention to the felt aspects of practice, therefore, is a turning towards the creation of meaning and generative thinking. As Walkerden shows, Einstein relied on such a mode of thinking:

> *We can see in Einstein's practice a central gestalt flip: for him wordless thinking is primary, and what is said is derivative. Implicit meaning (meaning that is felt) is the place from which fresh insight comes. He listened to his inarticulate 'knowings' for a long time, with great patience, allowing them to unfold. He describes, for example, reflecting for 10 years on what kind of 'universal principle' could take a central place in physics, given that neither mechanics nor electrodynamics (as he found them) provided what was needed. Out of this process came rejecting absolute simultaneity – a presupposition ordinarily taken for granted – and the special theory of relativity.* (2005, p. 176)

According to Walkerden (2005) and Gendlin (1997a), when faced with complex situations which demand new concepts and/or frames of reference, paying close and careful attention to one's felt sense of a situation surpasses heavy reliance on technical rationality and more analytically-oriented modes of thinking. It provides direct access to what Gendlin refers to as an evolving and ever present 'implicit intricacy' (1997a). 'Implicit intricacy' refers to experiencing which has not yet been explicated or expressed via symbols (Gendlin 1997a). It is implied in one's feel for or sense of a particular situation, and if one pays close attention in a bodily way it offers a rich web of embodied (i.e. organism-environment, relational) detail. This more bodily-oriented mode of

thinking – of felt sensing, knowing and understanding – relies on one coming back to the felt sense in an open, intuitive, and exploratory manner as in Schön's (1983) 'reflective practice' and contrasts with the less creative and less holistic application of predetermined scientific theories and techniques (described by Schön as technical rationality).[15] Schön points to this bodily sense of knowing or 'implicit intricacy' in this description of skilful intuitive practice:

> *When we go about the spontaneous, intuitive performance of the actions of everyday life, we show ourselves to be knowledgeable in a special way. Often we cannot say what it is that we know. When we try to describe it we find ourselves at a loss, or we produce descriptions that are obviously inappropriate. Our knowing is ordinarily tacit, implicit in our patterns of action and in our feel for the stuff with which we are dealing. It seems right to say that our knowing is in our action.* (Schön 1995, p. 49)

Outside of skilful practice, people rely on their evolving and ever-present sense of the 'implicit intricacy' of situations to varying degrees (Gendlin 1997a). It is relied on in some way in all forms of communication as one gets a handle on how one can express (i.e. symbolise in words, images, numbers etc.) what one wants to say about a particular phenomenon which is felt interiorly in the body as the felt sense. Even as I write this sentence, I am relying on finding some kind of resonance between symbols in the form of words and my felt sense of what I would like to communicate. This happens in all instances which involve expression of some kind, including nonverbal communication, and ranges in sensitivity to the 'implicit intricacy' from extremes of self-consciousness and un-self-consciousness.

Furthermore, there are a multiplicity of potential interpretations of any one aspect of experiencing (Gendlin 1997a). The symbol (word, image, number etc.) ultimately applied

[15] Importantly, this thesis argues that drawing attention to felt bodily processes may be helpful in providing insight into the intricacies of practice. This is not to suggest that one should pay more attention to the body over the mind; it is to suggest that the distinction between body and mind which is often taken for granted may not be as helpful in conceptualising processes of feeling, thinking and doing as one might anticipate. More integrative concepts like 'body-mind' or 'mind-body' are perhaps more fitting and are referred to in various places in this thesis to reinforce the notion of integration between them.

to an aspect of experiencing is one which is fit for the purpose of building one's own understanding of that experience and/or expressing one's understanding of *that* aspect of experiencing to others. Meaning which has been explicated in some way is, therefore, a snapshot of a dynamic interaction between one's evolving and ever present felt sense of a situation and the symbol/s one relies on to describe *it* (Gendlin 1997a). Walkerden illustrates this in describing the process of editing:

> *Consider editing a difficult or challenging piece of writing, for example a text like this. We can see here… we can engage our capacity to "feel" what fits, when we want to: as we read through the text we can check, in a very fine resolution way, whether we want to stay with the text, as drafted, or revise it. This is the form of solidity we want in reflection in reflective practice experiments. It is not 'omniscience', of course: we adjust our words so that they provide a precise "fit" to our experience of what was going on. If we discipline ourselves in this way, we add a kind of reliability to our process of reflection.* (2009, p. 255)

Importantly and perhaps obviously, one does not need to be particularly selfconsciously aware of this reflective and interiorly-oriented process in order to be highly (and successfully) reliant on it, but one needs and has a kind of background (or unselfconscious) awareness. Such is the case with many skilful intuitive practitioners who rely more on creativity and improvisation than on existing theories to carry out their work, but often cannot explicate their knowing (see quote above from Schön 1983, p. 49). This creates somewhat of a challenge for researchers interested in skilful practice at a fine resolution, one that Walkerden (2009) addressed by developing a model of reflective practice research which helps to elicit the intricacies of how skilful practitioners do what they do including microprocesses orienting (and re-orienting), making sense and finding ways forward in complex situations. Two main features are:

> *1. a focus on the "sense" practitioners make of their situations, rather than on what they can be observed doing as such; this allows for a much richer explication of practitioners' understanding; and*
>
> *2. formally differentiating between kinds of reflective thinking in a way that enables us to reproduce and demonstrate rigorous reliance on our*

> *practice experience as we reflect on how we oriented ourselves and how we are making sense of what is going on, etc. (as distinct from having the waters muddied by theories, narratives, etc. that we like and are inclined to lean on but that happen not to "fit" our experience in this particular case).* (Walkerden 2009, p. 251)

In concluding the case for inquiring into the fine grained and often felt aspects of skilful practice, it is worth reiterating why these kinds of skills are worth describing:

(i) levels of skilfulness varies in practice (Hendricks 2001; Gendlin 2007; Walkerden 2009);

(ii) heeding one's feel for situations makes distinctive contributions to skilful, astute and creative practice (Gendlin 1997a; Petitimengin-Peugeot 1999; Walkerden 2005, 2009); and

(iii) they can be taught, learned. (Hendricks 2001; Gendlin 2007; Walkerden 2009)

It is also worth reiterating that there are disciplined ways to investigate this mode of thinking and the underlying process skills (Gendlin 1996; Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999; Walkerden 2005, 2009), and that these kinds of skills are often pointed to but not particularly well-explicated (Walkerden 2009). There is, therefore, potential for clearer and more formalised process descriptions to make sharing practice knowhow easier within and outside of urban planning.

A fine grained inquiry into various aspects of skilful and creative architectural and private developer practices such as problem-solving, design and negotiation speaks to the cross-disciplinary interests of those looking to improve urban planning, design and development practice more broadly, and ensuing process outcomes. It also potentially speaks to the interests of those with a tighter focus on public planning practice (such as communicative planning theorists) and how urban plans, policies and practice shape private development practice and the quality of built form. It is possible that inquiring into urban development practice at a finer resolution than that attended to in existing planning literature (refer Forester, Healey and Innes), and resonant of the resolution of

practice discussed by those such as Gendlin (1996), Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and Walkerden (2005), could present opportunities to encourage creativity and innovation. The frameworks offered by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) are incomplete from the perspective of characterising intricate strands of practice.[16]

2.3 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PRACTICE DISCOURSES

The fine grained understanding of experiential practice that Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) illustrate is more formally disciplined and of a more intricate resolution than most research on architectural design practice. While various design researchers such as Alexander (1979), Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) and Cuff (1992) have shown a marked interest in the kinds of phenomena being investigated in this project, their work remains largely disconnected from a more inclusive appreciation of private architectural design practice as a potential source of insight for delivering (or not) on public planning goals. These various contributions which are more illustrative than exhaustive, focus on architectural practice and sensitivity at the kind of resolution that Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) discuss. I aim to extend these contributions to practice by leveraging their insights and providing a characterisation of skilful architectural design that builds understanding between the three practice traditions of architecture, private property development and public-sector urban planning. My intention is to map practice knowhow in a fine grained and first person-oriented manner may be helpful for teaching design skills to architects, property developers, urban planners and others working in similar contexts.

Pallasmaa's fine grained work on the embodied and experiential aspects of architectural practice is of particular relevance. As well as being a respected architect, Pallasmaa is the author of two significant texts on architectural theory, *The thinking hand: Embodied and existential embodied wisdom in architecture* (2009) and *The eyes of the skin:*

[16] Refer to TABLE 4.1 (p. 117) of this thesis which details the theoretical framework relied upon during data analysis.

Architecture and the senses (2013). Both have become important architectural design manuals which are oriented from the perspective of the designer experiencing the design process. Pallasmaa's work is influenced by the phenomenological tradition, especially the work of Merleau-Ponty (1968) and Bachelard (1994).

Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) gives primacy to embodied, experiential and felt aspects of design skill, and draws attention to architecture as a practice tradition and product which is increasingly devoid of such considerations. Taking inspiration from both phenomenological (e.g. Bachelard and Merleau-Ponty) and architectural traditions (e.g. Frank Lloyd Wright, Alvar Aalto and Glen Murcutt), Pallasmaa writes in a way that draws attention to the skilfulness of designing with sensitivity to felt experiencing as it comes in the body. He argues that current directions in architectural practice place too much emphasis on sight at the expense of bringing out its "physical, sensual and embodied essence" (2013, p. 35). In his view:

> *Contemporary architecture posing as the avant-garde is more often engaged with the architectural discourse itself and mapping the possible marginal territories of the art than with responding to human existential questions. This reductive focus gives rise to a sense of architectural autism,*[17] *an internalised and autonomous discourse that is not grounded in our shared existential reality.* (Pallasmaa 2013, p. 35)

His two major theoretical works *The Thinking Hand* (2009) and *The Eyes of the Skin* (2013) are architectural explorations of embodied or felt design thinking which is discussed as a means to understanding and encouraging a kind of somatic sensitivity in design work (resonant with Gendlin and Petitmengin-Peugeot's parallel investigations) that is not often discussed in detail.

[17] I am not entirely comfortable with the use of the term 'autism' in this quote as I feel it lacks sensitivity, however, I have retained it in the hope that it will not detract from the clarity one can get of Pallasmaa's (2013) intended meaning when the quote is read in full.

In a convincing attempt to address the neglect of the experiential and embodied in practice, Pallasmaa relies on his own substantial design experience and sensitivity to the felt processes of creating architectural detail. He provides the reader (who may not have architectural training) with a rich sense of what it means to experience designing by frequently framing the design process as a first person experience and drawing attention back to the traditional (and basic) tools of architects such as their eyes, hands and felt bodily processes:

> *during the design process, the architect gradually internalises the landscape, the entire context, and the functional requirement as well as his/her conceived building: movement, balance and scale are felt unconsciously through the body as tensions in the muscular system and in the positions of the skeleton and inner organs. As the work interacts with the body of the observer, the experience mirrors the bodily sensations of the maker. Consequently, architecture is communication from the body of the architect directly* [not mediated by technical rationality or similar] *to the body of the person who encounters the work, perhaps centuries later.* (Pallasmaa 2013, p. 71)

He is also very attentive to 'empathic imagination' (2014), that is, the ability of skilful architects to sympathetically imagine themselves in the shoes of imagined users of future built space (see Pallasmaa 2009, 2013, 2014). According to Pallasmaa (2014, p. 83):

> *A sensitive designer places him- or herself in the role of the anonymous user, and tests the validity of the ideas through this imaginative personal projection. Thus, the architect is bound to conceive the design for him or herself in the momentary adapted role of the actual occupant.*

Throughout his work, Pallasmaa advocates for the experiential and embodied, a kind of empathic engagement of architects with what it means to be human and interacting with built form. He presents architectural design work as a thinking, feeling and embodied practice:

> *The design process is a vague and alternating process of internalisation and projection, thinking and feeling, which becomes eventually increasingly precise and concrete.* (2014, p. 83)

Alexander is another architectural practitioner-researcher whose work resonates with this inquiry. He is less attentive to how design plays out in practice than Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) but his work is stimulating in the way it attempts to grapple with experiential concepts relating to architecture and provide practical responses to encourage quality built outcomes. Both *A Pattern Language: Towns. Buildings. Construction* (Alexander et al. 1977) and *The Timeless Way of Building* (Alexander 1979) were important influences in inspiring this research. Alexander's (1979) reference to 'the quality without a name' as an experiential marker of quality design is very resonant of the phenomena unpacked by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999). Alexander makes a point of demonstrating the inadequacy of naming such a quality in the first few pages of *The Timeless Way of Building* (1979) and in doing so, echoes Gendlin's (1997a) challenge to find a name for what he eventually called the 'implicit intricacy' – which points in a similar direction to a never-ending web of felt detail which one can come to know (experientially) and communicate in certain ways, but due to its complex, evolving and situated character, cannot fully explicate. Alexander's (1979) attempt at naming the 'quality without a name' includes terms such as 'alive', 'whole', 'free' and 'eternal', none of which quite fit as a descriptor, and so he settles for 'the quality without a name'. 'Alive', and its correlates of 'aliveness' and 'liveliness' etc., is perhaps the most useful everyday reference:

> *The quality without a name in us, our liveliness, our thirst for life, depends directly on the patterns in the world, and the extent to which they have this quality themselves. Patterns which live, release this quality in us. But they release this quality in us, essentially because they have it in themselves.* (Alexander 1979, p. 122)

The relationship between people and their environment being referred to here mirrors both Gendlin's (1997a) and Pallasmaa's (2009, 2013) work. Alexander's intuition (1979), like Pallasmaa's, is that the felt quality of architectural product (i.e. built form) is

substantially the result of the felt quality of practices which constitute the design and delivery processes of that product:

> *… many people will agree that a great architect's creative power, his capacity to make something beautiful lies in his capacity to observe correctly, and deeply. A painter's talent lies in his capacity to see – he sees more acutely, more precisely, what it is that really matters in a thing, and where its qualities come from. And an architect's power also comes from his capacity to observe the relationships which really matter – the ones which are deep, profound, the ones which do the work.* (1979, p. 218)

The 253 pattern languages presented by Alexander et al. (1977) are a first attempt to map design codes to be taken up by architects and others in their endeavours to promote 'the quality without a name', and a sense of 'aliveness' and 'wholeness' in built form. *A Pattern Language: Towns Buildings Construction* (1977) is clearly not intended to be an exhaustive or complete set of 'living patterns', but rather a step to provoke the explication and practical application of such patterns by others:

> *The Timeless Way of Building says that every society which is alive and whole, will have its own unique and distinct pattern language; and further, that every individual in such a society will have a unique language, shared in part, but which as a totality is unique to the mind of the person who has it. In this sense, in a healthy society there will be as many pattern languages as there are people – even though these languages are shared and similar.* (Alexander et al. 1977, p. xvi)

What is most important to acknowledge in Alexander's work in the context of this research, is 'the quality without a name' delineated in *The Timeless Way of Building* (1979). With this usefully awkward naming, Alexander points to the experiential and felt character of design along a continuum of living and dead. According to Alexander (1979), the presence of 'the quality without a name' is how one responds to 'living' aspects of design (or patterns), whilst its absence is a reference to that which comes from 'dead' design patterns. In doing so, Alexander foregrounds the impact of both skilful and not so skilful architectural design practice on the community. This is unlike Pallasmaa (2009, 2013), who focuses much more on the importance of architects being sensitive to the

intricacies of their own experiencing and imaginative projections as they design. In this sense, Pallasmaa's work, finely focused at the nexus between architectural practice and design, is closer to this inquiry. Still Alexander's uncovering of 'the quality without a name' is an important marker for the recognition of something very like what Gendlin (1997a) refers to as 'the felt sense' and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) refers to as 'the intuitive experience'.

Of course, the body has played an important role in architectural design work for a very long time, dating back to classical antiquity and Vitruvius's discussions of human proportion in *De Architectura* also referred to as *Ten Books on Architecture*. Bloomer and Moore's *Body, Memory and Architecture* (1977) has played an important role in drawing together a rich history of aesthetics and arguing the significance of the body in design practice, and the experiencing of built form more generally. Whilst Bloomer and Moore (1977) do not pay as close attention to practice from first person perspectives as Pallasmaa (2009, 2013), they do bring together important threads of architectural theory that frame the body as a haptic and receptive entity.[18] In their words:

> *The interplay between the world of our bodies and the world of our dwelling places is always in flux. We make places that are an expression of our haptic experiences even as these experiences are generated by the places we have already created. Whether we are conscious or innocent of this process, our bodies and our movements are in constant dialogue with our buildings.* (Bloomer and Moore 1977, p. 57)

Bloomer and Moore's (1977) thesis that architectural theory and practice has tended to overemphasise rationality at the expense of the haptic is very resonant of Pallasmaa's concern (2009, 2013) and is another important marker for recognition of something akin to the felt sense being at play in interactions with built form. The performance of the

[18] Additionally, according to Bloomer and Moore (1977, p. 37): "All experiences in life, especially experiences of movement and settlement in three-dimensional space, are dependent on the unique form of the ever-present body… If we can understand more about how we acquire and modify this psychic image of our own bodies, we may possibly obtain a better grasp of the way in which we perceive objects and settings around us".

body in architectural design practice has been carried forward by a number of people, most markedly by Franck and Lepori (2007), and Arakawa and Gins (2002) who indifferent ways consider design from first person and experientially-oriented perspectives.

Franck and Lepori's *Architecture from the inside out: From the body, the senses, the site, and the community* (2007) is one of a number explorations of practice located in the architectural literature which, like Bloomer and Moore (1977), Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) and Alexander (1979) draws attention to felt bodily processes as a way to understand and encourage skilful practice and provoke quality (experiential) outcomes.

> *It is from the body that we orient ourselves in the world. "Here" is where our bodies are located in space and "there" is some distance from them. The distance between the two is often described as the length of time it would take our bodies to get there, moving by foot or transport. Left and right, up and down, front and back, large and small, above and below are all defined in relation to our bodies. Many measurements used in architecture were originally derived from measurements of parts of the body - a foot, a yard of three feet, or the size of a brick as what the hand could hold. Many abstract structures for thinking and understanding also originate in bodily experiences of perception, movement and interaction with physical objects... Our ways of inhabiting the world, physically as well as psychologically and intellectually, extend from our bodies outward.* (Franck and Lepori 2007, p. 47)

Franck and Lepori (2007) argue the importance of seeing design as an evolving first person-oriented experiential process which demands that human feeling and sensitivity be, and remain, at the centre of the process of designing and encountering:

> *Architecture is given life and spirit by all the qualities that touch the human senses and the human soul: by light and color, sound and texture, by expansion and compression of space, by view and prospect. These might be considered literal qualities created by the manipulation of materials and space, but they can go beyond the literal to touch our souls. Architecture outside makes vision the primary, even the only sense and a distant observer the primary condition. Architecture inside*

> *whispers of intimacy, of one's closeness to the enclosure it always makes.* (Franck and Lepori 2007, p. 34)

The suggestion here is that designing in an interiorly-oriented and first person way supports quality architectural outcomes. This connects with Bloomer and Moore's (1977), Alexander's (1979) and Pallasmaa's (2009, 2013) intuitions that there is something significant and impactful in the haptic, embodied and/or experiential aspects of design practice which can provoke 'aliveness' in the final product:

> *Shaped from raw materials, the objects in the world of craftsmanship, although inanimate, embody and manifest the amount of participation as well as the skill brought by the maker into the creation itself, through his or her hands, mind, and soul. The more intense the participation of those hands and minds in the making and the greater their skill, the more alive the creation.* (Franck and Lepori 2007, p. 126)

Franck and Lepori discuss skilful design work with reference to an ability to be open in a bodily way to new and fresh insight whilst at the same time being grounded in the context. This is not about striving for some ideal but rather about explicating what it might mean to exercise increasing levels of sensitivity to the implicit experiential qualities of the design process including those that come with the commercial pressures of delivery. This overall theme of feeling 'alive' in designing and/or encountering a realised form points to Gendlin's description of the 'life-forward direction' in a psychotherapeutic context which comes from being attentive to the felt sense as a way to problem-solve:

> *From the verbal content alone we cannot decide what is a life-forward direction for a given person. But when something life forward comes inside the person, it is very clear. Yet it can be easily postponed, ignored, or denied. Therapists should respond tentatively when they cannot be certain that a given thing is experienced in a life-forward way. But when it becomes clear that it is life forward, and the client still ignores it, then the therapist must take a stand in favor of giving it priority.* (Gendlin 1996, p. 263)

Like Pallasmaa, Alexander, and Bloomer and Moore, Franck and Lepori seek to draw attention to the experiential and embodied aspects of architectural design practice and encountering built space. They do so in a way that is closely related to the work of Pallasmaa and his experientially-oriented descriptions of architectural practice. Reorienting architectural theory in this way, toward the body, is important and valuable work but there is more to be done as becomes clear when one compares this work with the intricacies Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) have uncovered.

Arakawa and Gins' (2002) *Architectural Body* may at first glance, except for the obvious connection in the title, appear somewhat removed from architectural theory but in fact is amongst the most relevant of the texts discussed in this chapter. From the outset, Arakawa and Gins (2002) problematise the very act of defining architecture and its relationship with the human body. This definition is indicative of the complexity of their work and resembles Gendlin (1996, 1997a) in terms of the primacy given to experiential orientation:

> *Architecture, in anyone's definition of it, exists primarily to be at the service of the body. The question arises as to how to be most fully at the service of the body. Who would not want to live in a world built to serve the body to the nth degree? The question arises as to what the body is in the first place. Serving the body to the nth degree will include as much as the body bargains for and more. It is mandated for the body that it fend off its own demise, and an architecture that would be unstinting toward the body, that would slavishly deliver up to the body all that it would seem to need, must take this as its mandate too.* (Arakawa and Gins 2002, p. xi)

What follows this definition is an artistic and philosophical inquiry into architectural design practice (the body in effect creating built form) which is at times echoes aspects of Gendlin's work. Arakawa and Gin's are known for challenging society's acceptance of mortality and focusing on how each encounter has the potential, with creativity, to offer life, and even immortality, a process referred to as 'reversible destiny'. This links to the idea that quality architecture provokes a sense of 'aliveness' that Alexander (1979), and Franck and Lepori (2007) speak of, and 'hapticity' or connection, that Pallasmaa (2000)

and Bloomer and Moore (1971) discuss. It also reflects a disappointment with the quality of built form realised that reflects Pallasmaa's (2009, 2013) and Alexander's (1979) concerns in particular:

> *Let our species cease being stunned into silence and passivity, into defeatism, by a formal architecture that seems so accomplished but leads nowhere. Members of our species have been stunned into passivity by what should be their greatest ally. To counter the deer-in-the-headlights effect, we have turned from speaking of architecture, vast architecture, to speaking of what of vast architecture a person can encompass in any given moment, naming this the architectural surround. This is architecture at the ready, at everyone's disposal. It is not monumentality but an approachable workaday architecture our species is in need of.* (Arakawa and Gins 2002, p. 39)

Like Gendlin, Arakawa and Gins (2002) are focused on the experiential aspects of creative process. Like those such as Pallasmaa, Alexander, Bloomer and Moore, and Franck and Lepori, they too see value in looking closely at the role of the body in design process. What is perhaps most strikingly obvious between *Architectural Body* (2002) and my research approach is Arakawa and Gins' deliberate non-delineation between thinking and feeling. They refer to the architectural process as 'thinking-feeling' as they seek to draw attention to the ongoing creative process of being an architect in the world. Their focus is on explicating the experiential character of what it means to be an 'architectural body' in the world. Architecture is discussed as a practice of 'thinking-feeling' and creating more generally; the body is discussed as a 'site' (that is, a place of experiencing) and experiencing itself as a complex web of successive and/or nested 'landing sites' which are marked by a sense of orientation:

> *the Architectural Body Hypothesis/Sited Awareness Hypothesis, a supposition that guides procedural architecture, would have it that a persona never be considered apart from her surroundings. It announces the indivisibility of seemingly separate fields of bioscleave: a person and an architectural surround. The two together give procedural architecture its basic unit of study, the architectural body. The Architectural Body Hypothesis/Sited Awareness Hypothesis puts*

> *forward the idea that embodied mind, a current way of referring to mind or awareness so as to give body its due, extends out beyond the body-proper into the architectural surround; the surrounding bioscleave needs to be weighed in as part of awareness's body. This hypothesis would have us never forget that we are babies of bioscleave and are therefore only comprehensible (to ourselves) in terms of it.* (Arakawa and Gins 2002, p. 51)

This framing of the architectural process is very resonant of Gendlin's persistence in carefully laying out the creative and evolving character of the experiential process (1996, 1997a; see also Gendlin's 2013 response to Arakawa and Gins). Here however, Arakawa and Gins, situate their intuitions more explicitly in the practice of architecture by examining the evolving and processual character of skilful design as a metaphor for creative experiential process.

Cuff's detailed but generally less experientially attuned account of the social aspects of architectural practice in *Architecture: The Story of Practice* (1992) relates to the work on communicative planning by those such as Forester, Healey and Innes. Cuff explicitly draws on Forester's (1985) notion of 'design as making sense together' that focuses on the negotiated and constructed realities of architectural practice, and as a result in many respects turns away from the more interiorly- or bodily-oriented aspects of design practice:

> *Based on this research, the more accurate description of the necessary skill is not decision making but sense making which corroborates Forester's work on planners and architects (1985, 1982). "If form giving is understood more deeply as an activity of making sense together, designing may then be situated in a social world where meaning, often multiple, ambiguous, and conflicting, is nevertheless a perpetual practical accomplishment" (Forester 1985: 14). The notion of sense making implies a collective context in which we must make sense of a situation, inherently social, interpret it, and make sense with others through conversation and action in order to reach agreements. How do we possibly train future architects in something as esoteric as sense making? Again, if we start with the studio, it is easy to find modifications that will contribute to this end.* (Cuff 1992, p. 254)

In particular, Cuff offers an explication of the commercial and interpersonal constraints (and opportunities) of practicing architecture at the scale of the firm. In doing so, she lays out many of the complexities of commercial design work and bends the traditional definition of 'designer' to include those who actively participate and involve themselves in the design process – such as clients who are sometimes private developers and other specialist design consultants. Cuff's in depth characterisation of architectural practice as a deeply social and collective process comes from her experience working as an architect and is an important reminder of some of the barriers to skilful design practice and outcomes. It does not, however offer insight into the experiential intricacies of architectural practice at the resolution discussed by, for example, Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999).

Abel (1981, 2014), Norberg-Schulz (1977), Seamon (2000) Seamon and Mugeraurer (2012, first published 1985) and Tuan (2011, first published 1977) each make valuable contributions to understanding the relationships between aesthetics and the body. Over four decades, they have independently sought to draw attention to the significance of the body and experiencing in designing and/or encountering built form, at times drawing on often divergent theoretical orientations, especially phenomenology, pragmatism and transcendentalism.

Norberg-Schulz's *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture* (1977) is credited with bringing Heideggerian phenomenological sensitivities to modern architectural theory and place-making. His reference to the term 'genius loci', a term which dates back to classical antiquity, to mean 'spirit of a place' has been influential in drawing attention to architecture and built form as significant experiential and felt phenomena,[19] and in promoting the practice of 'placemaking'. It is somewhat like Alexander's (1979) 'the quality without a name'. Norberg-Schulz's definition advances

[19] Norberg-Schulz was particularly interested in the "psychic [or experiential] implications of architecture rather than its practical side" (1980, p. 5). *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture* (1980) involved, for him, a move away from methods informed by natural sciences and towards the phenomenological intuitions of Heidegger. He drew particularly on Heidegger's use of the term 'dwelling', and considered 'dwelling' and 'existential foothold' synonymous and the purpose of architecture.

the connection between architectural practice and the creation of meaning in architectural form:

> *… the spaces where life occurs are places, in the true sense of the word. A place is a space which has a distinct character. Since ancient times the genius loci, or "spirit of place", has been recognized as the concrete reality man has to face and come to terms with in his daily life. Architecture means to visualize the genius loci and the task of the architect is to create meaningful places, whereby he helps man to dwell.* (1980, p. 5)

Tuan's (1974) reliance on the word 'topophilia' to describe the felt connection between people and place, and his subsequent formative work *Space and place: The perspective of experience* (Tuan 2011) offer sensitive geographical conceptualisations of the human experience of place, space and built form. Rich with everyday examples, Tuan effectively scaffolds the reader into a geographical way of thinking about what it means to be human and situated in space and place:

> *Every person is at the center of his world, and circumambient space is differentiated in accordance with the schema of his body. As he moves and turns, so do the regions front-back and right-left around him. But objective space also takes on these somatic values. Rooms at one end of the scale and cities at the other often show front and back sides. In large and stratified societies spatial hierarchies can be vividly articulated by architectural means such as a plan, design, and type of decoration.* (Tuan 2011, p. 41)

One of Seamon's core interests, like that of Pallasmaa (2009, 2013), Alexander (1979) and Norberg-Schulz (1977), lies in the idea that built form can designed, constructed and/or subsequently encountered in ways that support 'place ballets' (Seamon 1980) – life and 'dwelling', and a sense of wholeness and/or well-being. Like Norberg-Schulz and Pallasmaa, his method of inquiry leans heavily on phenomenology, and in particular the ideas of Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty.

Much of Seamon's work, and that undertaken with others such as Seamon and Mugerauer (2012), Seamon (1993), has been focused on finding ways to support such

an endeavour under the established but still somewhat emergent school of 'architectural phenomenology' and what was referred to as 'phenomenological ecology' (Seamon 1993), which focuses on the potential of phenomenological sensitivities to support architectural design and delivery processes that pay close attention to subsequent human experiencing:

> *Phenomenological ecology supposes that beneath the seeming disorder and chaos of our world and daily life are a series of underlying patterns, structures, relationships and processes that can be described qualitatively through heartfelt concern, sustained effort, and moments of inspired seeing and interpretation. Phenomenological ecology, therefore, only widens and deepens our knowledge of the world outside ourselves but also facilitates our own growth as individuals whose abilities to see and understand can become keener and more refined. We become more awake to the world, and see things in a more perceptive, multi-dimensional way.* (Seamon in Seamon 1993, p. 16)

Seamon took a substantial interest in extending Alexander et al.'s (1977) work on 'pattern languages' in a way that reflects Gendlin's (1996), Petitmengin-Peugeot's (1999) and Arakawa and Gins (2002) recognition of a synthesis between thinking and feeling, referred to distinctly as a 'felt sense' (Gendlin 1996), 'intuitive experience' (Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) and 'thinking-feeling' (Arakawa and Gins 2002):

> *Perhaps the major value of Pattern Language is* [a] *healing action…theory and practice, research and design, client and architect, natural and built environments are brought together through a sensitive tool of conceptualization. A supportive reciprocity is established between landscape and built environment and understanding and designing. In this sense, Grabow (1983) is correct when he suggests that Pattern Language marks a radically new architectural paradigm that has the potential to harmonize thinking and doing, conceptualizing and building.* (Seamon and Coates in Seamon 1993, p. 349)

Seamon's contribution is primarily in foregrounding the potential of taking a phenomenological approach to research and practice in architectural design. His careful consideration of what can be considered 'architectural phenomenology' is of significant

value in positioning human experiencing at the centre of the design process. There is room to expand on this work, however, in the direction of first person-oriented and fine grained empirical analysis of what goes on in skilful and sensitive architectural design work.

Abel's (2014) exploration of the concept of 'the extended self' and its implications for material outputs (including the built environment) draws on the work of many of those mentioned so far, such as Pallasmaa, Merleau-Ponty, Heidegger, Bloomer and Moore, Mugerauer and Tuan. In an earlier piece titled 'Function of Tacit Knowing in Design' (1981) and leaning rather heavily on Polanyi's recognition that "we know more than we can tell" (Polanyi 2009, p. 4), Abel (1981) makes the case (in support of Polanyi) for deeper consideration of reliance on 'tacit knowing' and its ties to bodily processes in architectural design practice. In Polanyi's words:

> *Whenever we use certain things for attending from them to other things, in the way in which we use our own body, these things change their appearance. They appear to us now in terms of the entities to which we are attending from them, just as we feel our own body in terms of the things outside to which we are attending from our body. In this sense we can say that when we make a thing function as the proximal term of tacit knowing, we incorporate it in our body – or extend our body to include it – so that we come to dwell in it.* (Polanyi [2009], p. 16 as quoted in Abel 1981)

As have others discussed in this chapter, Abel demonstrates sensitivity to the synthetic character of thinking and feeling:

> *Moreover, while the extended self is impacted by the bodily experience of inhabited spaces, it is not limited by those spatial dimensions but only by the technologies that enable people to absorb a more extensive social and cultural realm… Conceived here as a continuous loop beginning and ending with the body-mind synthesis, the extended self reaches outward to embrace a complex world of many kinds of experiences involving both interpersonal and cultural transfusions, but which nevertheless depends upon that same mind-body synthesis to make sense of everything. All of which has major implications for understanding the nature of the self as the outcome of an interaction between many different elements, including the material*

> *environment, rather than the independent spiritual or mental entity of much religion and popular mythology.* (Abel 2014, p. 3)

This synthetic conceptualisation of thinking-feeling and body-mind is an important thread running through many of the works discussed above. Whilst many (including those discussed) have recognised this embodied character of thinking, few have carried the work forward in the direction of Gendlin's and Petitmengin-Peugeot's analysis. Pallasmaa, Alexander, Bloomer and Moore, Franck and Lepori, Arakawa and Gins, Cuff, Norberg-Schulz, Seamon, Tuan and Abel have set the stage in many ways to expand analysis of skilful architectural and developer practice by providing complex synthetic considerations of various experiential aspects of architectural designing and encountering.

2.4 CREATIVE PRACTICE DISCOURSES IN PLANNING

In the urban design and planning literature that addresses architectural design principles from public interest perspectives, there are a number of texts which focus on creative practice and problem-solving skills at a resolution which makes them relevant to this project. These include those such as Albrechts (2005, 2015), Madanipour (1997), Sternberg (2000) and Higgins and Morgan (2000). In addition, Nigel Cross's (2001) seminal work speaks to design thinking more generally (and not necessarily in relation to urban planning). These works are important in the context of this research because they demonstrate a relatively long-term interest in practices of creativity and problem-solving, and in how such skills might be taught and/or stimulated for the betterment of urban design and planning processes and the ensuing outcomes. Valuable as they are, these works are not focused on practice at the very fine resolution discussed by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) which is the focus of this research. In general, they move away from the experiential and first person perspectives of the design process discussed in section 2.3 and turn attention to the (re)conceptualisations of creative practices at a far coarser resolution. The texts which are discussed in this section are ordered in a way that prioritises resonance with this intentions of this inquiry.

Of the works to be introduced in this section, perhaps the most sensitive to experientially-oriented architectural methods such as those discussed in the previous section is 'Designerly Ways of Knowing: Design Discipline Versus Design Science' (Cross, 2001) which borrows some of Schön's (1983, 1987) thinking on reflective practice, Alexander's general resistance to positive design methods, Rittel and Webber's (1973) characterisation of planning and design as fraught with 'wicked' and complex problems, and Simon's (1969) definition of design as a process which gives consideration to how things 'ought' to be. Whilst Cross (2001) does not pay close attention to practice at the fine resolution described by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999), his mapping of the development of thought around distinctions between methods of design and science is useful in the way that he positions design as transferable, through 'designerly ways of knowing, thinking and acting':

> *The underlying axiom of this discipline is that there are forms of knowledge special to the awareness and ability of a designer, independent of the different professional domains of design practice.* (Cross 2001, p. 54)

The kinds of knowing Cross is referring to are laid out as follows:

> *So design knowledge is of and about the artificial world and how to contribute to the creation and maintenance of that world. Some of it is knowledge inherent in the activity of designing, gained through engaging in and reflecting on that activity. Some of it is knowledge inherent in the artifacts of the artificial world (e.g., in their forms and configurations – knowledge that is used in copying from, reusing or varying aspects of existing artifacts), gained through using and reflecting upon the use of those artifacts. Some of it is knowledge inherent in the processes of manufacturing the artifacts, gained through making and reflecting upon the making of those artifacts. And some of each of these forms of knowledge also can be gained through instruction in them.* (2001, pp. 254-255)

Whilst Cross (2001) is helpful in positioning and paving the way for the extension of design thinking across disciplinary and sectoral boundaries, he leaves much room in his consideration of designerly forms of knowing for further exploration and explication.

In terms of those working on design practice specifically within urban design and/or planning in mind, Albrechts (2005, 2015) is of particular relevance with his focus on uncovering ways to foster creative practice which is both inclusive and generative. Although Albrecht's work is set within the urban planning literature rather than architectural design or philosophy, and focuses on planning rather than design, there are resonances with authors discussed earlier, such as Gendlin (1996), Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) and Arakawa and Gins (2002). Albrecht's (2005) attempt to foster a form of design thinking with its evolving and situated character relates to many of the thinking-feeling processes discussed earlier. What is glaringly different to the architectural work previously discussed is the resolution at which Albrechts describes such creative processes, which is coarser and not as experientially-oriented), and the fact that he is speaking largely to an urban, public planning audience.

One can see quite clearly how Albrecht's following definition of 'creativity' may apply (and be useful) across disciplines, especially for those working on planning, design and/or delivery of built form such as architects and/or property developers:

> *I define creativity as an individual – or preferably social – process that stimulates the ability to view problems, situations and challenges in new and different ways and to invent and develop original, imaginative futures in response to these problems, situations and challenges. 'Ability' focuses more on 'how' one thinks rather than on 'what' one thinks (see Michalko, 2001).* (2005, p. 249)

Albrechts (2005) is very interested in building on the concept of 'scenario planning' or 'scenario building' developed by Herman Kahn in the 1950s which he describes as follows:

> *The scenario derives from the observation that, given the impossibility of knowing precisely how the future will play out, a good decision or strategy to adopt is one that plays out well across several possible futures. To find that 'robust' strategy, scenarios, in essence, are specially constructed stories about the future, each one modeling a distinct, plausible place in which we might someday have/want to live and work. The creation of scenarios is all about making the forces visible that push the future in different directions, so that if they do happen, the planner/politician/civil society will at least recognize them and may be better prepared to respond. It is about making better decisions today for the future.* (2005, p. 255)

Rather than getting caught up in the legitimacy of 'scenario building', Albrechts focuses on its merits and potential usefulness as a notional construct for creativity in urban planning. He sees potential value in such an endeavour and the way questions pivoting from 'what if' may support the creation of "integrated images that articulate the shared hopes and aspirations of places" (2005, p. 255; see also Albrechts 2004). Albrechts (2005) adds to this the concept of 'envisioning' which relies not only on questions of 'what if', but also of 'what ought to be' (2005, p. 256). In Albrechts' view, entertaining possibilities of 'what ought to be' adds a critical layer to creative thinking in the public sector urban planning domain because:

> *Planning is not an abstract analytical concept but a concrete sociohistorical practice, which is indivisibly part of social reality. As such, planning is in politics (it is about making choices) and it cannot escape politics (it must make values and ethics transparent), but it is not politics (it does not make the ultimate decisions). Since the planning actions themselves are clear proof that such planning is not only instrumental, the implicit responsibility of planners can no longer simply be to 'be efficient' or to function smoothly as a neutral means of obtaining given, and presumably well-defined, ends. Planners must be more than navigators keeping their ship on course. They are necessarily involved with formulating that course (see also Forester, 1989).* (Albrechts 2005, p. 263)

The relevance of Albrechts' work (2005 in particular) to this project is twofold. He draws attention to the importance of creative practice in urban planning (at a relatively fine grain), and he creates the case for 'scenario building' which in his view carries the

potential to foster inclusive and democratic processes centred on collective generation and testing of new ideas. According to Albrechts (drawing inspiration from Forester 1989), there is a:

> *need* [for planners] *to shift from analysis, which seeks to discover a place that might exist, towards design which creates a place that would not otherwise exist. This is similar to Habermas's knowing (understand challenges and options available) and steering (capacity to take action to deal with challenges) (Habermas, 1996)…Scenarios augment understanding by helping to see what possible futures might look like. Scenarios help us to think about how places/institutions will operate under a variety of future possibilities and they enable decision-makers/civil society to detect and explore all or as many as possible alternative futures in order to clarify present actions and subsequent consequences.* (2005, p. 256)

Whilst 'scenario building' is not where this research is headed, Albrechts' analysis does offer a platform from which to see links between design thinking (in a broad architectural sense which spans multiple resolutions, as seen earlier) and the communicative planning work of those such as Healey and Innes. Of course, Forester's (1989) 'design as making sense together' and Schön's (1983) 'design as a reflective conversation with the situation' are important foundational markers for such a connection between design thinking and urban planning and these are discussed in more detail in the next section. Albrechts (2005) points to the first person fine grained character of creativity (and 'scenario building') but he does not attempt to uncover it at a finer and interiorly-oriented resolution as seen in the work of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999).

Higgins and Morgan's (2000) article titled 'The Role of Creativity in Planning: The 'Creative Practitioner'', like Albrechts (2005), also pays attention to the potential of creativity to serve the public interest but at an even coarser resolution than that discussed by Albrechts (2005). Higgins and Morgan (2000, p. 118) define creativity as "the ability to repackage or combine knowledge in a new way which is of some practical use or adds value". They recognise the complexity of conceptualising creativity and

make the case that understanding creative practice in relation to public sector planning warrants more attention. According to Higgins and Morgan:

> *Within the context of planning practice, creativity is important in terms of both process and product in a wide variety of contexts. On the one hand, creative practitioners are more likely to produce a valued end product such as a design or plan for a particular area. On the other, creative processes can, for example, reinterpret data in a novel way, negotiate a solution between apparently conflicting interests, devise policies responding to new dilemmas, develop new interpretations of the law or streamline procedures in innovative ways.* (2000, p. 119)

Their work reflects Albrechts (2005) in other ways too, as they focus not just on creativity as a support for problem-solving, but also as a support for the imagination and/or envisioning of alternative futures:

> *In order to meet the challenges of the 21st century, planners need to not only develop the capacity to creatively solve problems, but also develop a vision of what they want to achieve, and develop a mindset that is capable of reframing questions in new ways.* (2000, p. 119)

Working at a coarser resolution than Albrechts (2005) and his descriptions of how 'scenario building' and envisioning might support more creative planning practice, Higgins and Morgan (2000) make a valuable contribution in defining and arguing the significance of creativity for skilful, anticipative and resilient planning practice. Echoing the work of Hendricks (2001), they conclude that creativity can be taught in professional education and encouraged in the workplace. They do little, however, to unpack how creativity plays out in practice experientially, and how one might go about instilling such skills in the workforce.

Moving on to a more conceptual argument, Madanipour's (1997) 'Ambiguities of Urban Design' considers the challenges in defining urban design as a discipline. Following in the footsteps of Lefebvre (1991), he argues that in attending to the quality of built outcomes, one must focus on the processes which produce that space. Turning to the practice of urban design, Madanipour (1997), recognises substantial overlap and

interconnectedness with other practice traditions such as architectural design, landscape architecture and urban planning which add to the difficulty of defining urban design:

> *The professional ambiguity is felt more when the established disciplines and professionals of town planning, architecture, and landscape architecture are taken in account. Their areas of involvement overlap, despite their serious attempts to delimit their territories by different institutions and academic discourses.* (Madanipour 1997, p. 375)

What is most important to acknowledge in the ambiguities raised by Madanipour (1997), for the purpose of this thesis, is described most clearly by Billingham who claims that:

> *Urban design has emerged as a discipline, primarily because it is able to consider the relationships between the physical form and function of adjacent sites, unlike the Architect who is constrained by site boundaries and client intentions and the Planner who has been reluctant to address issues appertaining to the physical design agenda.* (Billingham 1994, 34 as cited in Madanipour 1997, p. 376)

This draws attention to urban design as a kind of public sector architectural design practice whereby, ideally, a broader set of interests are taken into account as a representation of the public interest. As Madanipour highlights:

> *If urban design is seen as visual management of the city centres only to maximise returns on private sector investment, then it is intended to serve a minority interest… If, however, urban design is practiced by the public sector, it is held to at the service of the public at large, contributing to the improvement of the quality of the built environment.* (1997, p. 377)

Given both the crossover (and potential for shared knowledge) between disciplines working in the context of urban development and the role of urban designers and urban planners in working with a broader set of interests in mind, it becomes rather clear that public sector planning regimes could benefit from a more intricate understanding of private sector practices such as architecture and private development.

> *Since the product of urban design is the manifestation of a set of policies or interests as solidified in physical space or its management, it becomes evident how the role of urban designers can be important. They would act as intermediary players in a complex interactive process. Their ability to convince others through all forms of presentation will have strong impacts on the process as a whole.* (Madanipour 1997, p. 380)

Madanipour goes on to discuss the practice of urban design at a much finer grain. Leaning on the work of Habermas (1984) in defining communicative rationality (and which was employed by those such as Forester (1989) in building the theoretical foundations of communicative planning), he encourages the letting go of divisions between practice traditions as either artistic, technical and/or social, and recognition of a complex process. His characterisation of urban design practice is inclusive and somewhat reflective of the notion of 'thinking-feeling' raised in various terms by authors such as Gendlin (1996), Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and Arakawa and Gins (2002):

> *Drawing upon the communicative action theory, we analyse the urban design process as a combination of three distinctive and yet interwoven threads; the stage when designers are interacting with the objective world through the application of science and technology; the stage when designers are involved with otter individuals and institutions constituting their social setting which is somehow involved in the process; and the stage when designers are interacting with their own subjective world of ideas and images. Depending on the circumstances, however, these analytically distinctive stages are usually closely interlinked to constitute a single, complex process.* (1997, p. 378)

Madanipour's (1997) careful extrapolation of the ambiguities facing urban design practice and blurring of the boundaries between the public and private sectors serves to broaden perspectives on the planning, design and delivery of built form in a way that is relevant to this project. This inquiry, however, is framed in a way that goes deeper into the intricacies of architectural and developer practice from first person experiential perspectives as a pivot point to discuss the more social and technical aspects of skilful practice. In this case, the ambiguities discussed by Madanipour (1997) (built upon later

by those such as Gunder 2011) have served as a way to think about the usefulness of a more complex understanding of architectural and developer practice for public sector planners and designers.

Sternberg (2000) also worked on locating urban design as a discipline working across public and private boundaries (in a physical sense). Extending in some ways on the work of Madanipour (1997) discussed above, Sternberg (2000) carefully argued the case that real estate markets left largely to their own devices will fail in public interest terms. Thus, public sector urban designers and planners have a responsibility to influence design outcomes in a way that creates cohesion and integration across public and private boundaries. The human experience – which is 'noncommodifiable' – should, in Sternberg's view, take precedence in public sector design decision-making. In Sternberg's (2000, p. 265) words: "good design seeks to reintegrate the human experience of urban form in the face of real estate markets that would treat land and buildings as discrete commodities".

This is interestingly reflective of many of those with architectural tendencies discussed earlier who advocate giving primacy to the human experiencing of both the designer and the imagined future inhabitants in their design work (see Pallasmaa 2009, 2013; Arakawa and Gins 2002, for example). Whilst Sternberg's focus here is on developing an argument for design principles – such as legibility, vitality and meaning – which are expected to promote cohesion, he does acknowledge the rather ambiguous and evolving character of urban planning and the importance of research (such as that found under the umbrella of communicative planning, that is focused on developing skills to navigate such uncertain waters:

> *Skilled in integrative principles of form, vitality, etc., the urban designer must still make her way within the organizational contexts of professional practice, negotiate and resolve disagreements, muddle along within the constraints of human knowledge, grapple with complex ambiguities, survive in a world of power imbalances, and present ideas with rhetorical force (see Forester, 1989; Innes, 1998).* (2000, p. 276)

Sternberg (2000), however, turns away from a focus on urban planning and design process and pays much more attention to the creation of a substantive theory of said design principles (resonant of Alexander et al.'s (1977) intuitions in creating the 'pattern languages') which in some ways attempt to distinguish the role of the architect from the role of the urban designer:

> *The urban designer's task is distinct from that of the architect (one working on a single property) because form, legibility, vitality, meaning, and comfort each act on observers across property lines and across the public-private divide. In our market-driven world, our experience coheres—or fails to cohere—across space that is otherwise segmented by ownership, use rights, and admission criteria. Operating according to an impersonal and autonomous logic, real estate markets slice up and subdivide the urban environment into self-contained compartments, generating cities that are incoherent and fragmented. Urban designers' primary role is to respond to this economic fact by reasserting the cohesiveness of the urban experience.* (2000, p. 275)

In recognising the weakness of property markets and boundaries in providing quality outcomes, Sternberg (2000) implicitly the notion that urban designers, and perhaps also planners, may benefit from a better understanding of the inner workings of architects and private developers.

Together, Cross (2001), Albrechts (2005), Higgins and Morgan (2000), Madanipour (2000) and Sternberg (2000) provide a cross section of relevant work on design thinking and creative practice as they speak to urban planning and design. Cross (2001) in his mapping of 'designerly ways of knowing' lays the groundwork reasoning for focusing on design thinking (as in the way that designers know, think and do) and the potential for broader application in the making of 'artificial' or built form. Albrechts (2005), drawing on the earlier work of Herman Kahn, builds on the notion of 'scenario building' and pays special attention to envisioning as a democratically motivated process which offers to complexify the decision-making process for urban planners by involving questions of 'what ought to be', as opposed to what is and/or what could be. Higgins and Morgan (2000), focusing specifically on an urban planning context, reaffirm Hendricks' (2001)

independent conclusion that creativity is both important and can be taught. Madanipour (1997) adds another dimension to thinking about urban design and planning by carefully laying out the ambiguities facing such practice. Without necessarily intending to do so, when considered alongside the work of Sternberg (2000), this opens up the potential for, and perhaps obligation, on public sector urban planners and designers to consider and implement strategies for creating cohesion across public and private sector boundaries. The 'noncommodifiability' of human experiencing and the inherent structural failure of real estate markets to adequately provide for the public interest (Sternberg 2000), whilst not a fine grained mapping of practice as was presented in the previous section, does provide an important motivator for careful consideration of private sector tendencies and skills which have broad public sector and public interest implications.

2.5 CROSS-DISCIPLINARY CHALLENGES TO COMMUNICATIVE AND AGONISTIC PLANNING

Turning now to urban planning (particularly communicative planning theory) and research which examines and traverses the traditional intellectual and disciplinary boundaries between architecture, private development and public-sector planning, there are several interesting opportunities. There is an opportunity to build on the cross disciplinary research of Adams and Tiesdell (2010), Carmona (2009), Imrie (2007), Imrie and Street (2009), and Lorne (2017) by providing another example of how one might draw connections between what are often considered distinct intellectual areas of study. The resolution at which this research is focused is the only example of experientially and first person-oriented research crossing the practice traditions of architecture, private development and planning that I am aware of. There are, however, numerous examples of intellectual interest and sensitivity to the nuanced character of public planning practice within the communicative planning tradition and the works of Forester (1989), Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997) and Innes (1995, 1998a, 1998b) particular. Perhaps this is not so surprising given that they build on the practice-oriented works of

authors such as Schön (1983, 1987), Giddens (1984) and Bourdieu (1990). Whilst attention to communicative planning is given in many instances to improve public-sector planning practice, little attention is paid to closely associated disciplines of architecture and development. This is perhaps surprising given that the foundation of communicative planning (also referred to as collaborative and deliberative) is to focus on qualities of interaction. There has been some research in making processual connections across disciplinary and sectoral boundaries (as seen in the work of Adams and Tiesdell 2010; Carmona 2009 etc.) and into public-sector planning practice, as seen in the communicative planning tradition. This section seeks to show that there is opportunity and reason to expand on this work with careful, experientially-oriented analysis of private sector practice such as architectural design and property development in relation to public-sector planning practice.

Through a geographic lens (and drawing especially on geographies of affect[20]), Lorne's (2017) 'Spatial agency' practising architecture beyond buildings' leverages ideas from spatial agency (see www.spatialagency.net) to explore architectural practice 'beyond buildings':

> *Drawing upon Lefebvre to re-assert that architects alone do not produce space, the ideas of spatial agency call for collaborative approaches that situate their design practices with much wider publics than that of the individual client.* (Lorne 2017, p. 276)

Lorne's (2017) interest is in understanding what it means to be a professional architect practicing in a contemporary context. He argues that the role of the expert architect in today's world is largely diminished and under threat in the competition for and accumulation of capital echoing in some ways Sternberg's (2000) concern about the failure of markets and the 'noncommodifiability' of human experiencing, and that architectural work has moved away from ethics towards aesthetics (see also Knox 1987).

[20] 'Affect' in the case of geographies of affect refers to modes of human experiencing situated in the world and encapsulated by Deleuze (1978) as: "a mixture of two bodies, one body which is said to act on another, and the other receives traces of the first."

Aesthetics being "the provision of 'window-dressing' for the short-term accumulation of capital rather than acting with responsibility towards wider publics" (Lorne 2017, p. 278).

Like Sternberg (2000), and building on the work of McNeil (2006), Lorne (2017) argues for regeneration of architectural skill within the public sector as a means of working towards built product which speaks to a broader set of interests:

> *Even a generation or so ago, a considerable proportion of architects, in the U.K. at least, were employed within the public sector, yet* [they] *are now increasingly competing for new markets, often at the expense of ethical responsibility (McNeill, 2006). It was insisted that the delivery of projects has become geared towards maximizing profit with very narrow concerns towards changing uses and future inhabitations.* (2017, p. 278)

Lorne (2017) positions 'spatial agency' as a conceptual framework for socially-oriented architects to relinquish their 'expert' status and provoke more 'open ended, participatory and lively' design processes which allows built form take on a collective, co-creational and democratic character. This socially-oriented framing of design work is said to encourage consideration of broader social and economic issues. If this is so, then looking more closely at architectural and private developer practice and from a more interiorly-oriented perspective might uncover some of the ways in which decision-making which pays heed to broader societal issues plays out for skilful architects and developers. It also offers food for thought regarding the potential usefulness of mapping skilful architectural and developer practice as representations of private sector practice in a way that speaks to the interests of public planners and the broader public good. Lorne's (2017) thinking pays heed to the often competitive relationships between private and public interests, and aesthetics, ethics and markets. This thesis seeks to build on Lorne (2017) by uncovering intricacies of skilful architectural and developer practice and their contrasting and/or complementary modes of thinking as a potential source of insight for public-sector planning practice.

Imrie's (2007) 'The interrelationships between building regulations and architects' practices' takes a slightly narrower focus and uses data from interviews with practicing architects to emphasise the interconnectedness between architectural design practice and building regulation. Imrie (2007) draws attention to reductive tendencies which lead to what he argues is misrepresentation and oversimplification of such relationships. Imrie's view is that:

> *By stressing the processual (inter)relationships between architects' practices and regulations, or the 'heteronomic' nature of the design process, a nonreductive understanding of regulatory process is possible. This is one in which totalising identities and naturalised categories such as `designer', `architect', and `building control surveyor' may be challenged and subject to scrutiny in ways that open up their mutidimensional and sometimes contradictory modes of thought and action (see Emirbayer, 1997, page 309).* (Imrie 2007, p. 941)

In doing so, Imrie (2007) turns attention away from oversimplified characterisations that suggest "building regulations, and the exercise of control, impose cost burdens and inhibit creative practice" (p. 941) and builds a more complex understanding of the reciprocity between public-sector planning regulations and architectural design practice. He argues that, far from being a burden on design:

> *regulation is core to architects' practices, and in turn such practices (re)define, in part, the scope and possibilities of regulation. If one accepts this proposition it seems incumbent on feature research to (re)centre the understanding of architects' practices within the broadcloth of the rules and regulations that, in turn, are part of the broader contexts within which architecture unfolds.* (2007, p. 941)

Like Lorne (2017), Imrie (2007) positions architectural design practice as a co-creational, co-constituted and complex endeavour. Based on interviews with eighteen architects, he concludes that architectural design practice is deeply entwined with public sector building codes and their making – the view of most respondents being that "regulations are constitutive of, and integral to, design practices" (Imrie 2007, p. 938). His view rejects the dualism often presumed to exist between architectural design and building

regulation. This is an important finding in the context of this research project because it reinforces the need to reconsider and challenge various categories and boundaries that are accepted within the urban planning literature, in particular, the autonomy and independence from regulation often granted to architects and their design work.

Building on the work of Imrie (2007) in particular (and others such as Carmona et al. 2003; Davis 2006), Imrie and Street's 2009 'Regulating Design: The Practices of Architecture, Governance and Control' suggests that:

> *the actions of architects, and other agents involved in the production of the built environment, are entwined in complex ways with a panoply of state, non-state and civil organisations, associations and relations. These relations extend to the entanglement of architects' creative practices with the pragmatics of the design process and, in particular, the regulation of design activity through the application of multidisciplines, and disciplinary behaviour, of diverse project professionals (see Baer, 1997; Habraken, 2005).* (Imrie and Street 2009, p. 2508)

Imrie and Street (2009) reaffirm the potential usefulness of broadening the research agenda to include more relational and co-creational perspectives on the planning, design and delivery of built product. In their view, relational and co-productive perspectives:

> *are helpful for steering analysis away from a conception of architecture as an autonomous sphere and are useful in (re)centring social scientific ideas into the study of urban design. However, we feel there is much to be done to develop such concepts to ensure that research based upon them does not reproduce reductive frames of analysis.* (p. 2515)

Their attention is focused on unpacking the social aspects of architectural design practice and their relationship with building controls as a means to better understand the creative process which shapes built form. Such a perspective broadens understandings of design to include:

> *networks that are part of the dispersal, or decentring, of the actions of architects, in ways whereby architects are engaged, increasingly, in complex, interdisciplinary teams of professionals in the negotiation of design outcomes.* (Imrie and Street 2009, p. 2508)

In situating architectural design practice as a complex and deeply social activity, Imrie and Street (2009), like Imrie 2007 and Lorne 2017, seek to encourage a move away from dualistic and reductive tendencies to research which is intricate and finer grained. In this instance (as with Imrie 2007), public sector planning regulations are seen as "part of a matrix of relations that influence the practices of architecture". Rules and regulations are integral to architectural design processes and subsequently, to varying degrees, "embodied in different forms, including language, text, (construction) materials, drawings and, of course, buildings" (p. 2509). That is because, "the shape of rules and their shaping of the practices of architecture, is part of a relational mixture of discursive practices and social and political processes" (p. 2509). With this understanding, Imrie and Street (2009) call for research which orients from a broader, more social and more complex appreciation of the design and delivery practices which shape built form which is inclusive of public sector planning practice. This is an important work which, when considered alongside others, in this section, the architectural, and urban design works discussed earlier, offers to expand understandings of and research into architectural design and urban planning in the direction of more social, complex and relational perspectives.

Carmona's (2009) 'Design Coding and the Creative, Market and Regulatory Tyrannies of Practice' reinforces ideas contained in Imrie (2007), and Imrie and Street (2009) on co-creational perspectives of the design and delivery of built form. In Carmona's resonant words:

> *The built environment is a collective endeavour, influenced by a diversity of stakeholders, each with a role to play in shaping what we see and experience as the architecture, urban form, public space and infrastructure that constitute the urban environment.* (2009, p. 2643)

What is perhaps most interesting about Carmona (2009) is what some might perceive to be a step back into an oversimplification of key stakeholder roles. Far from it, in my view, as his characterisation of certain tensions between the 'creative, market and regulatory', which can turn 'tyrannical' is very useful. These tensions often play a prominent part in planning, design and delivery processes and can play havoc on design quality if they do indeed turn 'tyrannical'. Not only does it set the scene for a broad and inclusive analysis of the creation of the built environment, but it also lays the groundwork for an understanding of planning, design and delivery processes that is sensitive to aesthetic, economic and regulatory drivers. In Carmona's words:

> *No one sets out to create poorly laid out, characterless places, to exclude good designers from the residential development process, or to prevent developers making a reasonable return on their investment. Despite this, the evidence suggests that too much of what has been built in the recent past has continued to display the former characteristics, whilst the latter perceptions remain widespread amongst affected groups.* (2009, p. 2664)

With this in mind, and building in particular on Bentley (1999) and his "idea of conflicting and varied power relationships, and the notion of multiple stakeholder aspirations" (2009, p. 2604), Carmona's (2009) core question centres on the role of design coding in both inhibiting and provoking certain design outcomes, and whether it is possible to code for good design. It is worth noting that this is rather resonant of Alexander's pursuits (1979) in the lead up to *Pattern Languages* (1979). Where Carmona (2009) lands, however, is somewhere quite different. He relies on Bentley's analysis and other literature to inform a different view of urban planning and development, one where three modes of practice come to the fore:

> *three distinct traditions – creative, market-driven and regulatory – each with a major impact on the built environment as eventually experienced. At their most extreme, each can be characterised as a particular form of professional 'tyranny' that has the potential to impact negatively on the design quality of development proposals. The word tyranny is favoured because it encapsulates a single-minded pursuit of narrow ends in a manner that undermines, or oppresses, the aspirations of others. Although actual practice is not typically situated*

> *at the extremes, there is value in exploring these positions which are extensively discussed in the literature and which, it is contended, to greater to lesser degrees underpin all practice.* (Carmona 2009, p. 2644)

He concludes that:

> *Although, it seems, some stakeholders will never accept any form of regulation as a positive contribution to the development process, the empirical evidence confirmed that* [site specific] *design codes do have the potential to overcome the tyrannies by setting the development process within a far more positive context of productive negotiation.* (Carmona 2009, p. 2645)

Carmona's (2009) exploration has particular relevance in regards to the tentative definition of these three (potentially 'tyrannical') modes of practice and/or practice traditions. In the context of this project, such a broad but still practice-oriented perspective was helpful in setting up what became an attempt to uncover intricacies of architectural and private developer practice in a way that informs understandings of planning, design and delivery as deeply social, complex and at times necessarily tense. Similar tentative practice divisions were explored, but with a different agenda. Instead of focusing on questions of the relevance and usefulness of site-specific design codes, this research looked for ways in which the skilful, and particularly the creative aspects of these sometimes distinct and sometimes shared modes of practicing might be useful to public sector urban planners. It is a different but resonant exploration which offers to complement work such as Carmona (2009), Imrie (2007), Imrie and Street's (2009) and Lorne (2017).

Adams and Tiesdell's (2010) 'Planners as Market Actors: Rethinking State-Market Relations in Land and Property' makes an important additional contribution to understanding aspects of urban planning and development processes as co-constructed. Building on Healey's (1992a, 1992b, 1997) work on state-market relations and Albrechts' (2006) push for better connectivity between public-sector planners and those delivering

built form, Adams and Tiesdell (2010) draw particular attention to public sector planner capacities to make (and re-make) property market conditions. Their primary argument is that:

> *since markets are socially constructed not given,* [public sector] *planners have much greater potential than they often realise to frame and re-frame land and property markets, rather than merely accepting or perpetuating current market conditions.* (Adams and Tiesdell 2010, p. 189)

Adams and Tiesdell (2010) argue for more research on the implications of such a socially-oriented and social constructionist perspective on public-sector spatial planning and in doing so:

> *seek to raise state–market relations in land and property to as central a place within the new spatial planning as that presently occupied by spatial governance, and thus to broaden debate on what "shaping and delivering tomorrow's places" might really involve.* (2010, p. 189)

This is resonant with some of the work already discussed, such as Carmona (2009), which pays attention to the conceptual development of the roles and modes of practice of urban planners and others in influencing what can unhelpfully become private sector and market-led development activity. In the same vein as many of those already discussed in this section, Adams and Tiesdell (2010) seek to dissolve the preconceived dichotomy between public sector planning and property markets and to reinstate a more socially-oriented and co-creational perspective of urban planning and development whereby plan and policy making are conceived as tools for market intervention. In relation to this inquiry, Adams and Tiesdell (2010) offer to strengthen the well-established intellectual thinking around urban planning and development processes as socially-constructed, complex and often embedded.

In addition, there are various examples within the planning literature of finer grained, and practice and public-sector oriented analyses. Those with interests closely aligned with the focus of this research include Schön's *The reflective practitioner* and in

particular, his characterisation of 'design as reflective conversation with the situation' (1983), Forester's *Planning in the face of power* (1989) and his notion of 'designing as making sense together', Healey's *Collaborative Planning: Shaping places in Fragmented Societies* (1997) and Innes' arguments for consensus building (1995, 1998a). Apart from Schön, who is arguably best known for his contribution to 'reflective practice', these works are often considered under the umbrella of the communicative, collaborative and/or deliberative planning tradition. Alongside of this, there are also various critiques of communicative planning, Bäcklund and Mäntysalo (2010), Flyvbjerg (1998) and Hillier (2002, 2003), which are addressed below. This sub-section raises relevant threads from Schön's (1983) work, and the communicative and agonistic traditions which help to clarify the intended contribution of this research.

Schön's (1983, pp. 76-104) chapter on 'Design as a reflective conversation with the situation' is an important characterisation of design which proposes that professionals in the architectural design, urban design and town (or public sector urban) planning practice traditions be considered under the banner of 'designers' on the premise that they each, in different ways, "produce plans for the physical structure of cities" (1983, p. 76). He goes on to explicate skilful design practice and argue that:

> *In a good process of design,* [the] *conversation with the situation is reflective. In answer to the situation's back talk* [that is, evident unintended consequences from previous moves]*, the designer reflects-in-action on the construction of the problem, the strategies of action, or the model of the phenomena, which have been implicit in his moves.* (Schön 1983, p. 79)

From the perspective of this research, this is an important acknowledgement that draws attention to finer grained aspects of practice. In this case, as with much of Schön's work, the focus is on the more social and interactive qualities of design – he is interested in what the practitioner can decipher from the 'situation's back talk' – as compared with the fine grained and often taken for granted intricacies of the experientially and interiorly-oriented process described in the earlier section on architectural design

practice, and unpacked and discussed by those such as Gendlin (1996), Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and Walkerden (2005).[21]

Schön's (1983, pp. 204-235) chapter 'Town planning: Limits to reflection-in-action', which explores historic shifts in the institutional context and role of planning regimes, also reflects his interest in the social character of planning practice. Here he broadens his focus to include private developers and their role in interacting with public planners. In Schön's words:

> *The planner's bargaining with the developer follows a familiar schema. There are two parties, each of whom has a stake in the outcomes of interaction. Each must communicate his own wants, learn what the other wants, formulate proposals, and learn the other's response to them. Each gives something in order to get something… In order to bargain effectively, the planner must know a great deal about costs and benefits of interest to the developer, and he must know a great deal about the board's likely responses to proposed concessions and about the effects of such concessions on the quality of building in the town.* (1983, p. 224)

These types of complex and socially-oriented characterisations of public planning practice are a common thread through much of Schön's (1983, 1987) work. Not only does he make the argument to broaden the categorisation of 'designers' to include not just architects but also public planners and urban designers, he also makes a strong case for seeing public planning practice (and other practices more generally) as sociomaterially constructed, interactive and necessarily creative to varying degrees. He concludes, variously, with a view of skilful practice as 'science in action' and inevitably reflective, which warrants more academic attention:

> *When practicing managers display artistry, they reveal a capacity to construct models of unique and changing situations, to design and execute on-the-spot experiments. They also reveal a capacity to reflect on the meanings of situations and the goals of action. A more comprehensive, useful, and reflective management science could be*

[21] Refer to TABLE 4.1 (p. 117) of this thesis which details the theoretical framework relied upon during data analysis.

> *built by extending and elaborating on what skilful managers actually do.* (1983, p. 266)

Schön's (1983, 1987) work on 'reflective practice' is also important to this study because it lays the groundwork in many ways for a finer grained analysis of how skilful architects and private developers do what they do. While Schön's work looks carefully at the social and interactive qualities of practice, especially public planning and architectural design, less so private development, it tends to neglect the finer and experientially-oriented features that Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) independently mapped. This inquiry is designed to attend to such a gap and to contribute to understandings of practice as both intrapersonal and interpersonal.

Forester's (1989) 'Planning in the face of power'**,** especially the chapters on 'Listening' (pp. 107-118) and 'Designing as making sense together'(pp. 119-133), provide an important backdrop which builds on the work of Schön (1983, 1987). This seminal 1989 text offers a rich characterisation of public planning as set in deeply political contexts of problem-solving. Forester's (1989) overarching claim is that the quality of conversation, debate and deliberation matter to the quality of public planning processes and ensuing outcomes. "Being able to anticipate and counteract practical misinformation" (1981, p. 41) is a particularly important skill in public planning situations where exercise of power have significant long term implications. In Forester's words, in:

> *Recognizing structural, routine sources of misinformation, the progressive planner seeks to anticipate and counter the efforts of interests that threaten to make a mockery of a democratic planning process by misrepresenting cases, improperly invoking authority, making false promises, or distracting attention from key issues.* (1989, pp. 46-47)

He goes on to argue that:

> *Planners can work to distinguish inevitable from avoidable distortions, ad hoc from structural distortions, and they may respond to these*

> *accordingly, so protecting reasonably informed planning and empowering citizen action as well.* (1989, p. 47)

For the most part, like Schön (1983, 1987), Forester's (1989) classic text foregrounds at a rather fine resolution the social, interactive and co-creational character of urban planning and development practice. There are times, however, as seen in the chapters on 'listening' and 'designing as making sense together' where he pays particular heed to the interiorly-oriented aspects of practice. 'Listening' represents a first person and socially-oriented view in the way that to listen, one must listen to something. In this case, Forester advocates listening to others as critical to public planning practice:

> *Planners not only must be able to hear words; they also must be able to listen to others carefully and critically. Such careful listening requires sensitivity, self-possession, and judgement. This is a critical part of paying attention – to other people and to substantive issues.* (1989, p. 107)

Throughout his work, Forester calls for public planners to be skilled in anticipating and counteracting misinformation. What Forester refers to as listening, is positioned as a politically motivated and powerful way to create a world together, that is, through democratic means. That is because, according to Forester:

> *In a world where people do not listen to one another, there may be decision, force, and violence, but there can be no collective mobilization or organizing, no collective social or political life.* (1989, p. 118)

The notion of 'designing as making sense together' is then argued (along a similar vein) as a helpful conceptualisation of the architectural design process with democratic intent. In this instance, however, Forester (1989) relies on explications of architectural practice to find resonances with other practices such as public planning and community engagement. Here, he engages with the notion of 'designing as making sense together' from at least two angles, that of the interiorly-oriented experiencing of architects and

the more socially-oriented feature of design in a broad sense. The first is seen in this characterisation of design practice as:

> *not just a matter of technical problem-solving.* [But] *a matter of altering, respecting, acknowledging, and shaping people's lived worlds as well. Significantly, designers cannot freely alter such worlds because they are, in part, products of their own culture, training and institutional settings.* (1989, p. 127)

And the second is illustrated by:

> *designers design with others as much as they do with their heads or hands…furthermore, wherever the creative impulse originates, the development, refinement, and realization of design is a deeply social process.* (1989, p. 132)

What is most interesting from the perspective of this research, is the absence of a finer grained, first person analysis of what goes on for professionals working in urban planning and private development contexts. Whilst Forester recognises and indeed points to the 'creative impulse' of architects, and implies such an interiorly-oriented process in public planning practice, he does little to investigate the finer resolution processes at play. Like Schön (1983, 1987) and with a similar interest in provoking skilful practice, Forester (1989) tends to focus more on the socially-oriented character of planning and design as opposed to the felt, experiential and embodied modes of thinking discussed by those such as Gendlin (1996), Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and Walkerden (2005).

Healey has a rich history of diverse intellectual interests spanning urban planning, property development and creative practice. Her early seminal work in the communicative (also referred to as collaborative) planning sphere (such as Healey 1992a, 1992b, 1996, 1997) has had a significant impact on the unpacking of public planning practice as influential, socially-constructed and interactive.

Most notably, Healey's communicative work builds on the earlier work of Habermas (1984), Schön (1983, 1987) and Forester (1989), and takes understandings of skilful planning practice deeper into the realm of different forms of knowing. Her analytical interest lies primarily in acts of speech such as those described by Habermas (1984) in his 'communicative rationality' offering. In 1992b, she advocated research methods which, like Schön (1983, 1987) and Forester (1989), focused on uncovering intricacies of public planning in practice contexts because:

> *Communicative skill is now recognized as an important quality of a trained planner. But we-still know little about what it involves or about the ethical dimensions of communicative work. The detailed study of planners at work should not only greatly assist our understanding of what skills expert planners use, but should also lead to an understanding of the circumstances in which planners can increase the overall sum of knowledge available to the communities they serve, and when they are merely serving powerful established interests.* (1992b, p. 19)

Healey's thinking on communicative planning, like Schön's (1983, 1987) and Forester's (1989), is that public planners can effect organisational and social change within everyday practice that pays attention to qualities of interaction and subverts that which undermines democratic process. Her work is about explicating what is needed to provoke skilful resistance within the public sector in particular by urban planners to undemocratic process, and like Schön and Forester, her attention is more on the social and interpersonal than the intrapersonal:

> *a communicative conception of rationality, to replace that of the self-conscious autonomous subject using principles of logic and scientifically- formulated empirical knowledge to guide actions. This new conception of reasoning is arrived at by an inter-subjective effort at mutual under- standing. This refocuses the practices of planning, to enable purposes to be communicatively discovered.* (Healey 1992a, p. 147)

Healey's main contribution to communicative planning and of particular relevance to this research, is her call for a focus on the potential of discursive planning processes and

consensus building, especially in public plan and policy making, to give effect to not only democratic process but also, perhaps as a result, democratic process outcomes. Her description of such a 'collaborative planning' process is:

> *A discursive process needs to be designed which explores different 'storylines' about possible actions and offers up different 'discursive keys' for critical attention, maintaining a critical attitude until there is broad support for a new strategic discourse. Having thus generated a knowledgeable consensus around a particular storyline, the task of consolidating the discourse and developing its implications can then proceed. The discourse community can be said by this time to have collaboratively* [or communicatively] *chosen a strategy, over which they are then likely to have some sense of 'ownership'. A new 'cultural community' has been formed around the strategy.* (Healey 1997, p. 279)

Whilst much attention is paid by Healey to opportunities to leverage the social and interactive qualities of public planning for democratic planning process, not much attention is given to skilful private sector practice and the effect this may have on public planning, nor is much attention paid (as with Schön 1983, 1987; Forester 1989) to the finer grained and experientially-oriented processes of how skilful planning practice comes about.

Perhaps this is not surprising given the depth and scope of these contributions, what is surprising though is that decades on, communicative planning still does not appear to have taken a closer look at either private sector practice nor the finer grained aspects of practice pointed to by Schön (1983, 1987), Forester (1989) and Healey (1997), and explicated by authors such as Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999).

Innes' (1995) early work on communicative planning was particularly important in defining what it means to be a communicative theorist with an interest in Habermas' (1984) 'communicative rationality' and working at the nexus between planning theory and practice. Innes' describes communicative planning research as:

> *grounded theorizing based on richly interpretive study of practice. Their* [the communicative planners'] *purpose is, on the one hand, to document what planners do and, on the other, to reflect critically on that practice. They apply intellectual lenses that are new to planning to illuminate and critique what they see. They see planning as an interactive, communicative activity and depict planners as deeply embedded in the fabric of community, politics, and public decision-making.* (1995, p. 183)

According to Innes (1995), Habermas' (1984) method of knowing involves a few distinct elements:

> *One element is self-reflection, designed to identify one's own rationalizations and uncover what is hidden in the self. A second, crucial concept is that emancipatory knowing comes from discourse or dialectic. Such discourse can illuminate the many sides of reality and, if designed properly, can uncover the rationalizations which reinforce power relations. A third way of knowing comes through praxis.* (1995, p. 186)

For Innes (1995), the critical point of contribution of communicative planning theory, unlike its more positivist predecessors is, as Habermas (1984) envisioned, the way it gives primacy to the 'messy' – interactive, social and necessarily political – character of public planning practice. Innes (1995) argues that communicative theorists, as distinct from other planning theorists:

> *see planners as actors in the world rather than as observers or neutral experts… They rely more on qualitative, interpretive inquiry than on logical deductive analysis, and they seek to understand the unique and the contextual, rather than make general propositions.* (1995, p. 184)

Innes (1995) made a significant contribution to the momentum of the communicative turn in planning theory by laying out a clear argument for the study of planning practice which arises from the notion that the "planning theorist's goal should be to help planners develop a new type of critical, reflective practice which is both ethical and creative" (Innes 1995, p. 185). Innes' work, as with Schön (1983, 1987), Forester (1989) and Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997), is motivated not just to understand and explicate

skilful practice but to do so in ways that contribute to ethical, just and democratic planning process, and process outcomes on the ground.

Following Innes (1995), Innes and Booher (1999) bring consensus building to the fore in the communicative planning literature as "a way to search for feasible strategies to deal with uncertain, complex, and controversial planning and policy tasks" (1999, p. 412). In the words of Innes and Booher (1999):

> *This practice is a more systematic and sophisticated version of a wide range of collaborative, communicative forms of planning with which both government and private players have been experimenting since the early 1970s.* (1999, p. 412)

Consensus building in Innes and Booher's (1999) terms is built on the Habermasian (1984) ideal of communicative rationality and work on interest-based bargaining by those such as Fisher and Ury (1999). Importantly, Innes and Booher (1999) explicitly state that:

> *Communicative rationality represents an ideal, rather like that of scientific rationality, which is never fully achieved in practice, though it is a goal or template against which to judge research or communicative practice.* (1999, p. 418)

Based on empirical analysis, they conclude that consensus building grounded in principles of communicative rationality is likely to be beneficial for public planning process for a number of reasons:

> *A process that is inclusive, well informed, and comes close to achieving consensus is more likely to produce an implementable proposal than one lacking these qualities. If it follows principles of civil discourse, it is more likely to build trust, foster new relationships, and create shared learning. If it encourages participants to challenge assumptions, it is likely to produce new ideas. Stakeholders are more likely to feel comfortable with a process they can organize themselves and more likely to be committed to its results.* (1999, p. 420)

The principles that underpin consensus building are compatible with a co-creational perspective on urban planning and development. The focus on process and foregrounding by Innes and Booher (1999) of the more social aspects of public planning echoes the work of Schön (1983, 1987), Forester (1989) and Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997). At the same time as making a valuable contribution to understanding public planning as interactive and co-constructed, in the context of this review of the literature, Innes and Booher (1999) reinforce the absence of work underpinned by similar social constructivist epistemological perspectives but with a more first person and experiential orientation. This inquiry complements the focus of communicative planning (and the like) with an emphasis on the skills that private sector practitioners need in managing themselves and in shaping how they think. It adds another dimension, the intrapersonal, to what constitutes a substantial body of work on urban planning as social process.

There are a number of critiques of communicative planning theory arising from the agonistic planning tradition that should be briefly addressed. These include Bäcklund and Mäntysalo (2010), Flyvbjerg (1998) and Hillier (2002, 2003). For the purpose of attending concisely to these critiques, communicative planning is taken to be consensus-oriented, and agonistic planning to be conflict-oriented (Bäcklund and Mäntysalo 2010).[22] Many critics of communicative planning have built upon the work of Mouffe (2000), which characterised democratic ideals such as communicative rationality as a futile endeavour of striving for a utopian and unattainable 'ideal speech' (Habermas 1984) which neglects political nuances.[23] Both Healey (2003) and Innes (2004)

[22] Bäcklund and Mäntysalo (2010) frame communicative and agonistic planning in the following way: communicative planning as participatory, deliberative and consensus-oriented, and agonistic planning as complementary and legitimately adversarial.

[23] In the context of this thesis, Mouffe (2000) discusses two important streams of 'deliberative democracy', those put forward by John Rawls and Jürgen Habermas. The predominant aim of deliberative democracy in these cases being "to reach forms of agreement that would satisfy both rationality (understood as defence of liberal rights) and democratic legitimacy (as represented by popular sovereignty)" (p. 3). Mouffe (2000) draws attention to the need for such theories to acknowledge social and power relations and the importance of 'agonistic pluralism' as a way to 'mobilise passions towards democratic designs'.

responded by reiterating their independent frameworks and intentions. Healey (2003), speaking about her grounding in Habermasian ideals, states that:

> *It is of course no surprise that many instances of practice are nowhere near the Habermasian criteria for an 'ideal speech situation' (Habermas, 1984; see Healey,* [1997]: *Chapter 8). Habermas did not put these forward as an actuality, but as critical questions with which to evaluate instances of governance interaction (that is, interactions in the public sphere).* (2003, pp. 109-110)

Innes (2004) on the other hand speaks of her grounding, and that of consensus-building in communicative planning, in the interest-based bargaining and negotiation coming out of the work on negotiation of those such as Fisher and Ury (1999), amongst others:

> *Consensus building has deep roots in practices and theories of interest-based bargaining, mediation and alternative dispute resolution, building on while transforming these for use in planning and policy making. Indeed, one can neither understand how consensus building works as a practical matter nor build theory about it without understanding this basic work (Fisher et al.,* [1999]; *Moore, 1987; Susskind and Cruikshank, 1987).* (2004, p. 6)

Healey's (2003) and Innes' (2004) responses demonstrate a number of misunderstandings of communicative planning which have led, at least in part, to some of the aforementioned critiques. The contribution of communicative planning to this inquiry lies mainly in its focus on the finer grained interactive aspects of planning and its interest, in associated disciplines such as architectural design and private property development. It does not claim to engage with politics or power relations in any substantial way except if and when embedded in the skilful practice of participants.

The 1980s and 1990s was a seminal period in planning discourse which saw the emergence of communicative planning theory as a way of framing how public sector urban planners might encourage quality urban outcomes by focusing on interactive qualities between stakeholders. Significant contributions from Forester (1989), Healey (1997), Innes (1995), Innes and Booher (1999) and others generated substantial debate,

research and shifts in public planning practice. Though much productive work has been done since this time, especially in relation to how public planners might stimulate outcomes that protect and advance public interest, little attention has been paid to the empirical and experientially-oriented foundations of skilful private sector practice.

2.6 DISCOURSES ON PROPERTY DEVELOPERS' PRACTICE

This analysis returns here to the seminal communicative planning discourse of the 1990s and the rich work of thinkers such as Healey, Forester and Innes. Paying attention to architectural and developer practice at a fine resolution is a means to understanding the felt, experiential and interiorly-oriented aspects of how private sector practitioners involved in urban development processes design and deliver built form. This aims to pursue a slightly different path to that taken by much of the previous literature, building on those seminal contributions in order to speak to the interests and ambitions of communicative planning to foster democratic processes for quality urban outcomes by applying insights from the intricacies of property developer and architectural design practice to the wider challenges of contemporary urban geographies.

Since the 1990s, various models of the property development process have been identified. These include 'event-sequence models' (Healey 1991), 'agency models' (Healey 1991), 'production-based approaches' (Gore and Nicholson 1991) and 'institutional models (Ball 1998). Unpacking dynamic relationships between and within structure and/or agency in the context of property development has been of particular interest in certain more recent works such as Coiacetto (2000, 2001) and Guy and Henneberry (2002). There have also been various calls in the property development literature for research that takes models of the property development process (often underpinned by divergent theoretical orientations) toward additional layers of intricacy, especially in regard to understanding practice.

Those calls are generally in line with increasing recognition of property development as a deeply social and complex process:

> *Urban development is a complex process which entails the orchestration of finance, materials, labour and expertise by many actors within a wider, social, economic and political environment. The physical building is the tip of an iceberg with much that is hidden beneath the surface.* (Guy and Henneberry 2002, p. 5)

Despite this growing interest in practice, inquiries into private development practice have not delved particularly deeply into the nature of what developers do unlike the research into architectural design practice. The lived experiencing of practitioners is for the most part abstracted from to lay out more formal and analytically-oriented models of development processes. There are exceptions such as Coacietto (2000, 2001) and Guy and Henneberry (2002). This section discusses the relevance of these works.

Coaicetto (2000) highlights the significance of private property development in the delivery or failure to deliver on public planning aspirations, and builds a case for more empirical research which pays heed to the diversity of development practice, and does not "treat the treat the development industry as an undifferentiated whole, [or] as if all developers were the same" (2000, p. 353). As part of his argument, he provides a reminder that:

> *Planners do not build cities and towns. Rather, they are built by private sector interests, developers in particular. In order to shape urban development, planners have to influence the actions of the players who actually build cities. This requires a sound understanding of the perspectives, actions and strategies of those builders.* (Coiacetto 2000, p. 353)

Building on the work of others such as Gore and Nicholson (1991) and Healey (1992c), Coiacetto goes on to argue the importance of understanding the industry diversity, and in particular that of private property developers. His assessment is that existing research and empirical analyses:

> *… either treat developers as an undifferentiated homogenous group, or else focus on players in a specific sector of the industry such as*

> *residential or industrial development. Furthermore, they often tend to focus on the most prominent developers, not on the range of players who are involved in the creation of an urban place. This selectivity is a barrier that inhibits a full appreciation of the nature of city builders and prevents the achievement of a fuller appreciation of urbanisation processes.* (Coiacetto 2000, p. 354)

What Coiacetto (2000) is pointing to here is the somewhat surprising absence of substantial interest in the intricacies and sociospatial diversity of private developer practice. Coaicetto goes down a slightly different path, however, of eliciting developer conceptualisations of public planning and development as a way of beginning to piece together different approaches to development activity (Coiacetto 2000). He concludes by distilling his findings into two developer outlooks or characterisations:

> *one outlook is narrower, more local, but less exclusive and possibly more egalitarian. The other is more assertive, more worldly, more imaginative, more self-assured, less restrained and somewhat elitist.* (Coiacetto 2000, p. 369)

He then makes a tentative link between the contrasts and the quality of built outcomes realised on the ground. For example, "[in the] Byron Shire, the appearance of buildings and development is generally more interesting, inventive and innovative compared to Ballina" (2000, p. 370). This article shows that differences exist between developers and that, as suggested by Carmona (2009), in his work on site-specific design coding, these kinds of sociospatial differences may have implications for approaches to public planning process.

Coiacetto (2001) builds six developer typologies based on the same empirical data as that relied on in his 2000 piece discussed above. Here he takes a finer grained view of private developer behaviour and uncovers a cross-section of motives, objectives, approaches and strategies. His attention remains with the theme of diversity in developer behaviour and his conclusions are interesting and very relevant to this research. Coaicetto argues that:

> *Planners cannot deal with the different types of players identically, as each responds to planning strategies in different ways. Some kinds of strategies will encourage some types of developers and discourage others. An amateur player – a passive local property owner who feels pressured into developing property and is ambivalent and uncertain about carrying it out – warrants a different planning approach to other players. Their realm of experience is limited, and planners would need to provide extra attention to ensure a quality product, advising them of the possibilities and alternatives for their site.* (2001, p. 55)

In thinking about relationships between, and potential leverage points in, the work of Coiacetto (2000, 2001) and others discussed in this review, it becomes clear that the sensitive and critical public planning responses Coiacetto speaks of echo the kinds of fine resolution processes discussed by authors Forester (1989) and Schön (1983, 1987), for example, their conceptualisation of 'designing making sense together' (Forester 1989) and 'design as reflective conversation with a situation' (Schön 1983). What they lay out here, is a need for, and indeed ways for, planners to be poised to respond critically to the 'diversity' of situations that Coiacetto speaks of. What none of them seem to do, however, is look closely at the interiorly- and experientially-oriented character of how developers and other private sector players such as architects do what they do, and consider what this might mean for public planning practice, such as being able to understand more of what goes on in the private sector development world, and therefore able to respond with discernment in negotiations.

Guy and Henneberry's (2002) edited collection 'Development and developers: Perspectives on property' contains a number of articles that are relevant here. This is particularly true for Rick Ball's chapter on developers in local property markets (pp. 158-180) and Guy's chapter on environmental innovation and the social organisation of the property business (247-266). Each concur with Coiacetto's call for more research into private developers themselves and each contribute to knowledge of developer practice and what it means for urban development processes such as policy making. This collection of essays, like Coiacetto (2000, 2001), pays attention to the behavioural aspects of property development and especially to the situated and diverse character of private developers. According to Ball:

> *Developers – large or small, local or external, public or private – reside at the core of any property scene. They are often the principal initiators of action in local property markets and have great powers of influence over local economies. In particular, decisions made by development companies to build, adapt and develop industrial space, either independently or in collaboration with local authorities, will have a huge influence on the capacity of any local economy to attract investment, and given research findings from around the world (Ohrstrom 2000), to nurture new or existing businesses.* (Guy and Henneberry 2002, p. 160)

Further:

> *The role of developers in the local property arena has been a relatively underexploited area of investigation… Future research will be wise to explore the wider lessons for understanding the fine detail of the developer business that might be learned from the experience of the re-use market.* (Guy and Henneberry 2002, p. 179)

Ball's interest here (2002, 158-180) is on the influence of the local economy on private development activity and how developer's perceptions of markets, and their opportunities, influence their decisions. His contribution is to expand understandings of developer behaviour via survey data collected at a relatively coarse level, compared with that attempted in this research and described by those such as Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999).

Guy's 'Developing interests' article is rather more sensitive to the nuances in perceptions and attitudes (2002, 247-266). He opens with this statement:

> *The basic nature of attitudes is radically more complex, more richly textured and less solid than normal survey methods can reveal. The theoretical point is that knowledge cannot be entirely separated from institutional and other social relations (Shackley et al., 1996, p. 214).* (Guy and Henneberry 2002, p. 247)

By attending to the ways social, political and commercial pressures shape development practice (including that of architects, developers, investors etc.), Guy opens up

important questions about the co-creational and socially-constructed character of private development. Like Forester (1989), he draws particular attention to the diversity of power in such activities, noting that:

> *Building design is continuously shaped through a series of complex negotiations between real estate actors, in the context of wider technical, legal and commercial constraints, as they each attempt to extract value from development activity. The design specification represents the material outcome of this process. However, not all viewpoints will necessarily be represented in the development proposal. Depending upon market conditions, some real estate actors will have more power to influence the process than other actors.* (Guy and Henneberry 2002, p. 259)

He concludes by calling for more research focused on uncovering more of the complex, situated and dynamic character of social agency in property development. In Guy's words, such research:

> *would unpack the contrasting 'frames of reference' shaping debates around design and specification choices, rather than starting with the individual decision-maker, so producing a more contextual appreciation of the dynamics of environmental innovation.* (2002, p. 265)

Whilst Guy's intuition is to go deeper in the material context in relation to 'specification choices', this project is designed to investigate from the felt, experiential and embodied ground of architectural and developer practice as a means to illustrating how private sector practitioners deal with the co-creational context of development activity.

The works of Coiacetto (2000, 2001) and Guy and Henneberry (2002) are two of the most resonant examples from the property development literature. Coaicetto (2000, 2001) draws attention to the diversity and influence of sociospatial variations in developer behaviour; Guy and Henneberry (2002), and in particular Guy's chapter on 'Developing Interests' (2002, 247-266), shows how research into development practice has tended to focus on the more social aspects as a means to uncovering complexity and

deepening understandings. Whilst these works are important reflections of a movement toward a more nuanced appreciation of development as dynamic, contingent and co-created, at the same time they reveal an absence of attention on the felt, embodied and experiential as a potential area of insight. It appears, from my review, that none have looked as closely at private developer practice as Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) demonstrate is possible. As will be discussed further in empirical Chapters 4 and 5, this thesis responds with an experientially-oriented fine grained analysis of architectural and developer practice, and consideration of its relevance to public planning.

2.7 CONCLUSION

The kinds of practice descriptions contained in the literature discussed in this chapter have played a critical role in shaping the research framing, methodologies and research outcomes. Communicative planning theory sets a conceptual frame for the interactive, communicative and political character of public planning practice and in doing so implies that looking closely at private architectural and developer practice is of interest to public planners. The practice-oriented property development literature, whilst a much smaller body of work, points to a need for further and more nuanced research into the diversity of private developer practice. The urban design literature which focuses on the need for creativity and design skills in public planning practice as a means to influencing private sector practice has played an important role in reinforcing the significance of process, while the architectural design literature offers the richest explications of practice as embodied and experiential and, offers descriptions closely aligned with those of Gendlin (1997a) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999).

The relationships of the works discussed in this review to this project is both central and marginal. It is central in the sense that this inquiry seeks to contribute in some way to the body of knowledge of each of these traditions. It is marginal in the sense that design of this research is likely to speak primarily to the interests of those who see value in experientially-oriented perspectives in urban development practice, and especially that

of architects, private developers and/or public sector urban planners. Those coming to this research with an interest in architectural design practice (and works such as Pallasmaa 2009, 2013; Alexander 1979; Arakawa and Gins 2002; Franck and Lepori 2007 etc.) are likely to find the architectural and experiential orientation (albeit on architectural and developer practice) relatively easy to digest. The attention given to private developers, and the consideration of both practices in relation to public sector urban planning might come as a surprise. Those with an interest in the creative skills which underpin urban design and planning (and works such as Albrechts 2005, 2015; Madanipour 1997; Sternberg 2000; Higgins and Morgan 2000) are likely to find the fine resolution attention to the ways creativity comes about both interiorly and sociomaterially of interest. As with the architectural practice tradition, the inclusion of property developer practice may seem somewhat out of place. Those who are sympathetic to the interests of communicative planning theorists (such as Forester 1989; Healey 1997; Innes 1995, 1998a) and their attention to understanding and democratising the interactive aspects of public sector planning practice are likely to find the finer grained and cross-disciplinary character of this inquiry heartening. Those whose focus is on the private property development process, especially private developer practice, are likely to find the close attention to developer behaviour of interest. The attention on architects may be equally relevant, particularly if they come at property development with a social constructivist lens, but it may equally seem peripheral. The distinctly phenomenological approach of this inquiry, responding to the work of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999), may seem rather foreign to all but those with experientially-oriented tendencies.

There is much more than public planning practice at play in transitioning between land use planning and regulation, project design and built product. Whilst the architectural, urban design, communicative planning, cross disciplinary and property development literatures discussed here are helpful in laying out some of the groundwork for an appreciation of urban planning which is broader than just public planning practice, there is still much to be done to build an understanding of planning process and outcomes as inclusive and intertwined with private sector practice. What appears most absent in the

literature, however, is careful attention on the more interiorly-oriented and lived aspects of private sector practice. This inquiry into architectural and developer practice at a fine resolution is an attempt to contribute to and deepen understandings of skilful practice as experiential, situated and co-creational. From a practice perspective, it explores possibilities for the cross-pollination of insights and skilfulness between public planning, architectural design and private property development.

3: METHODOLOGICAL FRAME AND RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 ORIENTING FROM PHENOMENOLOGY AND GROUNDED THEORY

Phenomenological approaches to practice research focus on lived meaning and the source/s of meaning (Van Manen 2014). The research reported in this thesis explores the ways in which skilled practitioners in architecture and private property development perform their work. It adopted a phenomenological approach, drawing on interviews with skilled architects and property developers. There is no singular set of phenomenological methods. Key thinkers in phenomenology such as de Beauvoir (1972), Heidegger (1996), Husserl (2012), Levinas (1969), Merleau-Ponty (2002), Sartre (1956) and developed a range of distinct methods. However, all relied on methods for paying close attention to lived experience, and modes of interpretation, analysis and synthesis that allow for attention to micro details of experiencing and situatedness. In the phenomenological tradition, writing is a reflective process which facilitates analysis and demands sensitivity to the nuanced character of lived experience. In this study, I drew on Van Manen (1990, 2014) and Todres (2007) in particular for inspiration in research design, especially in crafting research questions that enable a fine resolution exploration of professional practice, identification of the key characteristics of skilful practice, and consideration of the wider implications for urban outcomes.

For phenomenologists, experiencing and meaning arise in processes of everyday existence (Van Manen 2014, p. 35). Van Manen observes:

> *Lived experience may be considered the starting point and end point of phenomenological research. It may be argued that many other qualitative research approaches also take human experience as the*

> *main epistemological and ontological source. This is true. But for phenomenology the concept of "lived experience" (Erlebnis) possesses special philosophical and methodological significance. The notion of "lived experience" announces the intent to explore directly the originary or prereflective dimensions of human existence.* (Van Manen 2014, p. 57)

In pursuing a focus on practice and the creation of meaning for skilled practitioners, and in paying attention to the situated character of public planning practice to uncover intricacies of being, knowing and doing at a fine resolution, this study has followed the lead of researchers such as Forester (1989), Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997) and Innes (1995, 1998a) whose interest is in supporting the education, practice and critical social engagement of public sector planners and others involved in delivering urban outcomes.

For the reasons explained in Chapters 1 and 2, this thesis addresses these specific research questions:

(i) what kinds of gestures shape skilful architectural and private developer practice at a fine resolution – that is, close to the creation of meaning;
(ii) what kinds of roles does heeding a felt and bodily-oriented sense (Gendlin 1997a) play in such practice traditions, particularly in instances of problem-solving, designing and negotiating;
(iii) how do these gestures (and other insights that emerge from the data) speak to the research interests of the relevant communicative planning, urban design, property development and architectural literatures?

This chapter conceptually frames these questions against the processes of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006) and phenomenology, and explains the methodological choices made in pursuing the research. It discusses methods of data collection and analysis, the ethical issues and solutions considered in this inquiry and the implications of the approach developed as the research worked to elicit the kinds of microprocesses that underpin skilful architectural and developer practice.

Phenomenological sensitivities (see Van Manen 2014; Todres 2007) informed the choice of research questions and how these were framed during the interviews (e.g. empathically directing participants towards their tacit knowledge). Constructivist grounded theory provided the backbone for the analytical method which unlike Glaser and Strauss' (2008) original formulation, affirms the usefulness of leveraging existing theories. This research relied on Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) as reference points in building a grounded theory in the form of a partial model of practices relied on by the participants.[24] Nicolini (2012) makes a strong case for eclecticism in practice research because theory is unsettled, and this is reflected in the combination of methods adopted in this research.

Van Manen's phenomenological approach to practice research (2014) and Nicolini's validation of multiple methods and 'theory-method package' (2012) provided a conceptual framework for the methodology, while Charmaz' constructivist grounded theory (2006) offered an adaptive methodology which informed data collection and analysis. The analysis focused on deep engagement with the interviews with skilled practitioners.

Data was collected via semi-structured interviews following the principles and procedures of constructivist grounded theory. Potential participants were selected on the basis of their reputation, profile, track record and the seniority of appointment, which were considered to reflect skilfulness, and were recruited by invitation. Semi-structured interviews provided interviewees with opportunities to explore their own experience and allowed me to follow the flow of their insights. As a researcher, I adopted an attitude of empathic engagement (akin to 'the open body' referred to by Todres 2012 and Gendlin's 'focusing' 2007) to allow space for participants to explore their own

[24] In contrast with more traditional definitions of theory which emphasise explanation of particular phenomena, grounded theory stresses "indeterminacy" in understanding and views theory as necessarily "abstract and interpretive" (Charmaz 2006, p. 126). In Charmaz' words: "Interpretive theory calls for the imaginative understanding of the studied phenomenon. [A grounded] theory assumes emergent, multiple realities; indeterminacy; facts and values as linked; truth as provisional; and social life as processual" (2006, p. 126).

process and make room for unrehearsed reflections. The interviews were enhanced in many cases by the fact that the interviewee and I were already known to each other through industry connections or because we had worked together, and this helped to establish a comfortable rapport.[25]

The analytical process was informed by constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006) which gives permission to modify techniques and sequencing as one sees fit, and to lean on other theoretical foundations. NVivo data analysis software was used to establish connections between practitioners, and to distinguish specific gestures and metaprocesses. These offered the analytical and conceptual frames for deeper reflection on the significance and implications for wider urban practices that are presented in Chapter 6. The parallel frameworks of 'the felt sense' (Gendlin 1996) and 'intuition' (Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) were an important platform to test and refine the characteristics of various gestures.

Analysis occurred at a fine resolution and whilst a number gestures emerged from the qualitative analysis of patterns in the process, reading the interview transcripts through the lens of process models developed by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) provided a foundation for elaborating descriptions of core practice that architects and private developers rely on. It served as a tool for comparative analysis and refinement. Nicolini's 'theory-method package' (2012), which emphasises zooming in and zooming out of the data during analysis mirrored constructivist grounded theory

[25] Existing rapport with participants was an important part of the research design for two key reasons. In a number of instances, those whom I did not already know declined an invitation to participate whereas those I already knew, despite being very busy, were inclined to accept invitations and be generous with their time. Also, the focus on a kind of 'feeling-thinking-doing' as opposed to more analytically-oriented modes of thinking threw some participants off focus early on in the interviews but having established some kind of rapport assisted me, and at times noticeably the participants, in feeling at ease in taking the time needed to settle, reframe and refine questions and responses and elicit further intricacies of the area under study. Whilst it may be that in some instances an existing relationship may create partial reportage, in this case the methods were designed to guard against such possibilities. See for example the critical distance granted by the recording and transcribing of interviews, and grounded theory and the application of comparative analysis in Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.5.

(Charmaz 2006) and supported the identification of gestures and metaprocesses to characterise skilful practice.

Limitations of the research discussed include those pertaining to constructivist grounded theory as a methodological frame, insider-outsider research (Corbyn Dwyer and Buckle 2009) and participant profile. Ethical considerations discussed include researcher qualifications and experience, participant profile, recruitment and consent, benefits and risks of research, privacy and confidentiality, and reporting and dissemination of results.

3.2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMING

The conceptual framing of this inquiry is rooted in practice theory (Nicolini 2012), constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006), gestures (delineated in the work of Gendlin 1996 and Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) and metaprocesses (as defined in section 3.2.4). Practice theory (Nicolini 2012) was adopted as a useful conceptual frame for understanding practice research as it is attentive to the complex and socially-constructed character of what goes on. According to Nicolini:

> *Practice theories accept that discursive practices are central to the construction and reproduction of all organizational life and social things, but resist the idea that language and discourse (understood as language in action) alone can explain all the features of organizational life. Practice approaches suggest that we need theories that take into account the heterogeneous nature of the world we live in, which includes an appreciation that objects and materials often bite back at us and resist our attempts to envelope them with our discourses.* (2012, p. 8)

Constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006) was employed as a methodological frame primarily because it offers a set of procedures that support research design and analysis for fine resolution investigations of practice. The concept of gestures (Gendlin 1996; Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999), was used as an analytical tool to distinguish

microprocesses in the data from each other. This framework was a particularly helpful touchstone in the early phases of analysis when the skills were only beginning to emerge. As it turned out, the notion of gestures became a critical thread running throughout analysis. The concept of 'metaprocess', as a family of gestures employed to do something helpful within the wider practices of architecture and property development, emerged from the data and was relied on as a way to organise and present the models of designing and negotiating practice as composites of certain gestures. This section shows how each of these frames came together to assist in organisation and presentation of the models of practices uncovered in the data.

3.2.1 PRACTICE THEORY AS ANALYTIC ORIENTATION

The task of practice theory is to inform research that focuses on increased understanding of practice rather than outcomes and offers an appropriate conceptual frame for this research:

> *Practice theories depict the world in relational terms as being composed by, and transpiring through, a bundle or network of practices. In doing so they join forces with other relational sociologies and reject the idea that the world comes nicely divided into levels and factors, or that there is a fundamental distinction between micro and macro phenomena (Reckwitz 2002; Latour 2005). Practice theories conceive social investigation as the patient, evidence-based, bottom-up effort of understanding practices and untangling their relationships. They question how such practices are performed, and how connected practices make a difference; they ask why it is that the world results from the coming together of several practices is the way it is, and how and why it is not different.* (Nicolini 2012, p. 8)

Practice theories foreground the processual character of existence. They contribute to scientific knowledge by uncovering various aspects of practice, activity, performance and work that shapes process outcomes (Nicolini 2012, p. 3). They are attentive to and appreciative of the relational and networked character of the world. Individual professional practice is situated within a field of practices which is itself connected, networked, richly textured, discursive and non-discursive. Such an appreciation is

helpful to frame the research reported here because it offers an eclectic epistemological and methodological platform, bringing together multiple approaches from which a practice-based inquiry can be launched. Whilst there is no unified practice theory (Schatzki 2001), the work of a number of key critical practice theorists such as Giddens (1984), Bourdieu (1977, 1990), Heidegger (1996), Wittgenstein (1953, 1969) and (Nicolini 2012) together provide a perspective of practice:

> *The practice view embraces the idea that organization emerges as the results of sense-making, but eschews the idea that sense-making constitutes an intangible mental process…Sense-making and knowing are thus foregrounded, but they are located in the material and discursive activity, body, artefacts, habits, and preoccupations that populate the life of organizational members.* (Nicolini 2012, p. 7)

Nicolini's (2012, pp. 219-238) 'theory-method package' has been used in developing this research. This 'theory-method package' has three higher-order features:

1. zooming in on practice especially with regards to tools, materials and the body;
2. zooming out to discern the relationships and associations identified as constituting practice in space and time; and
3. "Using the above devices to produce diffracting machinations that enrich our understanding through thick textual renditions of mundane practices"(2012, p. 219).[26]

Nicolini's (2012) validation of a variety of epistemological and methodological approaches, and his description of zooming in/out (which is resonant of constructivist grounded theory) gave a high-level frame to the research as pragmatic and practice

[26] What Nicolini meant by 'diffracting machinations' is expressed in plainer language in the following: "A further requirement of the zooming out is to explain how local practices can act at a distance and produce effects in different places and different times, how they can contribute to an even 'wider picture' and, conversely, how events and phenomena that take place in distant places (and times) manifest through the actual local practice. This is, of course, a critical step in order to avoid the trap of localism… or its equally unpalatable alternative; that is, the need to invent mysterious metaphysical entities (collective conscience, culture, social representation, genes…" (2012, p. 235). This encourages zooming out to a wider view of practice and seeing practitioners as mediators in a complex web of interactions.

oriented. His high-level 'theory-method package' was relied on for analytical orientation and was found to be complementary to the phenomenological methodological approach drawn from Van Manen (2014) and Charmaz' constructivist grounded theory methods (2006). As a composite, they guided interviewing and analysis.

3.2.2 GROUNDED THEORY A METHODOLOGICAL FRAME

Charmaz (2006) proposes constructivist grounded theory as a pragmatic and interpretive methodological frame. Her approach adapts classic grounded theory (introduced by Glaser and Strauss 2008) and acknowledges the co-creation of theory from data and interpretive analyses (Charmaz 2006, 10; Mills et al. 2006a, 2006b; McCann and Clark 2003a, 2003b) as opposed to discovery (Glaser and Strauss 2008). For Charmaz, theory emerges by looking carefully at instances, occurrences and/or patterns of the phenomena under study reflected in the data. That is, one's understanding of the phenomena under examination emerges through analysis. Meaning is co-constructed between researcher and participants as one progresses through data collection, note taking, coding, 'memoing' (Glaser and Strauss 2008), reflecting, re-engaging and writing. A grounded theory explains the processual character of the phenomena under study in a new theoretical frame (Charmaz 2006). Careful attention is paid to the way processes emerge and change over time including their preconditions and consequences. Constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006) emphasises the interpretive and co-creative character of qualitative research, and the importance of flexibility in the application of methodological rules. Multiple meanings may come out of any data set, and the goal of Charmaz' constructivism is to uncover (or perhaps more precisely co-construct) one or more of those interpretations in the form of a grounded theory.

An early step in the constructivist grounded theory approach requires open coding of the data set to build conceptual categories and memoing of theoretical insights and explanations that arise from the coding. This process commenced early in data collection and was reiterated during the research journey to inform refinements to the research data. The initial (or open) codes were subsequently and iteratively refined through a

process of comparative analysis, and as a result focused codes or categories emerge from the data. The grounded theory, in this case a partial model of practices,[27] was refined in the writing process. It serves to synthesise the knowledge arising out of a refined set of codes and memos of theoretical hypotheses. In an ideal scenario, one ceases open and focused coding, memo-writing, theoretical sampling, constant comparative analysis, and writing at saturation. For pragmatic reasons, the point at which one stops work may be influenced by pressures other than saturation but not before a convincing explanation has been delivered (Nicolini 2012, p. 238).

Charmaz' constructivist grounded theory (2006) provided a methodological frame for this research and offered steps to follow through data collection and analysis. This was coupled with Nicolini's higher-order 'theory-method package' (2012), which foregrounds zooming in and out of the data until one has developed a convincing conceptual framework. This zooming in/out is resonant of analytical moves in constructivist grounded theory, and the notion of building theory from fine grained analysis and incrementally 'clustering' outward from the data (Charmaz 2006). Both constructivist grounded theory and practice theory emphasise process over outcomes, encouraging an analytical process which remains faithful to the data throughout analysis and presentation of findings. Staying close to the processual characteristics revealed in the data was important in the research design because of the absence of existing first person and experientially-oriented models of architectural and developer practice.

3.2.3 GESTURES AND THE FELT SENSE AS AN ANALYTICAL FRAME

The research focused at a fine resolution on the practices revealed in the interview data. In drawing understanding of practices from that data, and drawing on the work of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999), the research built a series of 'gestures'

[27] The model of practices developed in this thesis is referred to as 'partial' in recognition of the grounded theory perspective on theory as building understanding which can always be carried further (see Charmaz 2006, p. 126). This thesis uses grounded theory methods to build a process model (a description of gestures and the metaprocesses they are embedded in) of skilful architectural and developer practice. The model is partial with regard to what architects and developers do, but is nonetheless considered important for understanding these practices.

which underpin architectural and developer practice. A gesture is identified as a communicative action or performance that carries meaning. Gestures are intricately woven into the fabric of what goes on in the world broadly speaking, regardless of the narrowness of context within which the gesture may appear to come about. Gestures play a role in this research as process descriptions of interiorly-oriented micro passages of practice. Gestures are microprocesses created by the one gesturing to carry their process forward in some way. They come from the meaning one gives to 'felt experience' (Gendlin 1997a), and are shaped by the skills one relies on in professional life.

There is a certain intentionality associated with the concept of gesturing which gained empirical significance during analysis. Both architects and property developers gesture as a means to progress from the abstract toward the concrete. This inquiry into practice began with a focus on process (explored by Nicolini 2012; Todres 2007; Van Manen 2014; Charmaz 2006; Glaser and Strauss 2008) and 'the felt sense' (Gendlin 1996, 1997a). Framing the phenomena under study as gesturing and constituted by gestures, was a helpful way to describe the kinds of processes taking place at a fine resolution. Analysis began by looking for gestures within the data which appeared to play a significant role in the architectural design, and negotiation and delivery of built form.

The felt sense underpins all concepts, observations and actions; it is present whether one conceptualises one's experiencing or does not (Gendlin 1997a, p. 65). It is an essential and ever-changing aspect of existence.

> *Experience is not divided into pieces that are either past or present or future in a linear sequence. Each moment is a new constellation in which the past functions implicitly – and hopes for the future, along with hopes for the future from the past, are recontextualized.* (Gendlin 1996, p. 67)

Listening to and receiving from 'the felt sense' as described by Gendlin (1996) is comprised of four distinct gestures. These are 'clearing a space', 'the felt sense', 'asking'

and 'receiving'. This conceptual framework named the 'metaprocess of problem-solving' (and recognised as a parallel to the work of Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) was relied on in the early stages of data analysis as a useful analytical frame and platform against which additional gestures arising out of the data could be compared and subsequently refined (via comparative analysis, focused coding and memoing). This 'metaprocess of problem-solving' and its underlying gestures provided a very fine grained theoretical model of experiencing and the creation of meaning which was relied on as an analytic starting point (in terms of resolution) for architectural and developer practice.

Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot's (1999) work in particular provides a strong basis for concluding that the gestures described have sound empirical support in relation to their power and generality. Gendlin's related research summarised by Hendricks (2001), offers evidence of efficacy of the gestures in problem-solving. Petimengin-Peugeot's (1999) and Walkerden's (2009) discoveries of the same process being influential in many practice traditions also supports this claim. This thesis proposes that building on the theoretical foundations of others such as Gendlin (1996), Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and Walkerden (2005) is both valid and useful. The interview questions were devised in light of the identification of the importance of microprocesses – and in particular how meaning evolves and is experienced somatically – with respect to the work of Gendlin (1996), Petitmengin Peugeot (1999) and Walkerden (2005, 2009).

3.2.4 METAPROCESSES AS A BROADER ANALYTIC FRAME

A 'metaprocess' describes a group of fine grained gestures which deployed together do something more general. The metaprocesses discussed in this thesis are the 'metaprocess of problem-solving' (underpinned by gestures defined by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999); the 'metaprocess of designing'; and the 'metaprocess of negotiating'.

This extends the concept of gestures, and came about through an iterative analytical process that resulted in the explication of metaprocesses at a coarser resolution, and

underpinned by distinct gestures. The term 'metaprocess' is not intended to imply a strong hierarchical frame; it is intended to describe a familial relationship between certain sets of finer resolution gestures and to indicate that certain gestures combine functionally to achieve something. The use of the term metaprocess was in part informed by a constructivist grounded theory method of making sense and creating meaning, and in part informed by Nicolini's (2012) 'theory-method package' of zooming-in-and-zooming-out and delineating the relationships of gestures to one another. The 'metaprocess of problem-solving' is used to describe the family of gestures coming out of the parallel discoveries of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999). The additional metaprocesses uncovered are in designing and negotiating. The 'metaprocess of designing' is primarily a reflection of skilful architectural design practice (as discussed in Chapters 4 and 5). The 'metaprocess of negotiating' is primarily a reflection of skilful private developer practice (as discussed in Chapter 5).

3.2.5 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

The research questions aim to elicit the knowhow of skilful practice of the research participants at a fine resolution, beginning with the felt sense. Semi-structured interviews, underpinned by open-ended questions and an empathic attitude toward participants were important in the research design. Skilful practitioners engaged in everyday professional practice are not always able to articulate their own knowhow (Schön 1983, 1987). The research design had to be able to carve out a space for self-inquiry as difficulties in articulation arose. This was critical to drawing out finer resolution aspects of skilfulness that are often tacit and hard to articulate. Honing in on the disciplines of architecture and property development was a pragmatic decision to limit the scope of the research, and to focus on 32 private sector professionals who play significant roles in urban development and its interface with public planning. Examining architectural and developer practice at a fine resolution means that political pressures and/or demands are a typical constraint. Attending to architectural and developer practice is one way to broaden the influence of communicative planning. Another might

be to pay more attention to politicians and the political systems through which decisions are shaped.

The research is based on 32: 13 architects, 13 developers, two financiers and four public sector planning-development officials. This dataset is typical of grounded theory research (Creswell 1998), and comparable to that used in many other studies of expert professional practice at a fine resolution (such as Schön 1983; Forester 1989). The participants occupied principal positions within their respective organisations as directors or senior executives, experience of more than 20 years in private property development and associated practice traditions, and between them have amassed multiple prestigious industry awards as individuals, and/or as representatives of development projects or their organisations. The organisations themselves primarily focus on offering built product to the upper-middle, high-end and luxury property markets, and the experience of these participants was gained in developing relatively high-quality residential, commercial and/or retail premises.

This is an inquiry into skilful practice with a view to uncovering insights for architects, developers and public sector urban planners, and is not designed to uncover intricacies of standard or average practice. The insights emerging from this research of the three practice traditions suggests that looking closely at the practice of these participants is a means of opening a door to the richness of gestures and metaprocesses that may be highly relevant to practice in the fields of architecture, private development and public sector planning.

Data was primarily collected via semi-structured interviews with high profile and/or well-established architects and private property developers based in Australia. Participants were selected based on reputation, experience and level of appointment within their organisations. Additional interviews were carried out with a number of project financiers (with a particular interest in property development) and those occupying senior roles within public sector planning regimes. Participants were recruited by invitation, the large majority of which were accepted without fuss and

interviews scheduled easily. Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the property development setting and Australian context, the majority of the participants were male (30) and there were two females.

Interview questions were open-ended and centred on how participants approach practice, for example, inspiration, creativity and problem-solving (see Appendix 2: Indicative Interview Questions). These were used as touchstones to generate questions during the interviews. Participants were also asked what architectural or built qualities such as aesthetics, beauty and liveability mean to their design and delivery practice, how they recognise success and failure in their own work and how they manage and promote teamwork and high-performance. Questions were open-ended and during the interviews, participants were encouraged to slow down and reference their own process by drawing on and describing particular instances in detail. Moments of silence, or deliberation which resulted in tentative and evolving responses that could perhaps have been perceived as awkward in a formal interview or business setting were welcomed.

The line of questioning and focus of the interviews was adopted to suit the atmosphere and willingness and capacity of the interviewees. If participants appeared to be struggling to establish and/or losing a connection with their own process, an attitude of empathic engagement with experiencing was encouraged, much like that described by Gendlin (1996) as being friendly to 'the felt sense', and Todres' (2007) description of 'the open body' and phenomenology as a humanising force. This challenge of learning to articulate once own process at a fine resolution is illustrated in Todres' description:

> *"[there is a] back and forth between the 'more' of experiencing and the differentiations of language continue as a productive process of more refined understanding. And this is welcome and received as almost a relief of tension in my body. The meanings feel more digested and I would feel in a better position to dialogue these meanings with others and bring them into the shared world of intersubjective understanding".* (2007, p. 26)

Empathy was an important strengthening component of the methodological orientation. An empathetic approach to qualitative interviewing is supported by those such as Parlington (2001) and Kvale (1992). Both emphasise the potential of empathy to enhance the interview process and quality of data collected. As Parlington (2001, p. 35) states: "The establishment of empathy and rapport is essential if respondents are to disclose information to interviewers".

If time, space and empathy were not effective in enabling the participants to describe intricacies of their own process, questions were reframed and where possible participants were encouraged to stay with the unfolding of their own knowing (about their practice). In responding to the interview questions, all interviewees explained their practice in ways that acknowledged and emphasised felt bodily processes. Most but not all interviewees were able to establish, maintain and explicate the intricacies and in particular the felt aspects of their own creative process in a way that made a significant contribution to analysis.

Raw interview data was audio recorded on two devices (in case one failed) and reflexive notes were taken at the time of the interview and shortly afterwards to record additional observations and impressions (nonverbal, for example). Audio files were then transcribed into clean verbatim text files for interpretation and analysis. Whilst a list of professionals who were interviewed is attached and there were no ethical requirements to de-identify data (refer Appendices 2 and 3 attached), identifying characteristics such as names of people, organisations and projects were removed from the analysis in Chapters 4 and 5 to avoid distraction from the areas of interest being described.

Transcripts were read to identify microprocess categories (i.e. gestures in some way connected with 'the felt sense') first for all participants, and then again within their respective practice traditions as architects, developers, financiers and planners. Throughout the coding process, each of the gestures were compared with one another and memos were used to record insights about how the gestures might relate to each other and help to form a model of practices. At this point, having coded the transcripts

for initial gestures, architectural and developer practice stood out as rich, distinct and sometimes resonant practice traditions.

Rather than branching out to planner and financier transcripts, the focus turned to further analysis of architectural and developer practice. The relationships between the gestures which had emerged from the architectural and developer data were considered in terms of preconditions and consequences, and tested back against additional instances in the data to refine the gestures and their characteristics.

There were many iterations of coding and analysis prior to the emergence of the conceptual framework of gestures and metaprocesses. The iterative analytical process was needed to construct a conceptual framework that was both convincing theoretically and pedagogically accessible (Nicolini 2012, p. 238). The iterative process of coding, analysis and synthesis (adapted from Charmaz 2006) can be summarised in seven steps:

1. initial open coding at pace for microprocess categories and emergence of tentative gestures close to the data;
2. comparative analysis of tentative gestures with additional architectural and developer transcripts;
3. memoing for recording explanatory analytic insights (continued throughout);
4. focused coding, testing and refining of gestures in relationship to one another;
5. testing for the presence of gestures identified by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999);
6. considering gestures in relation to each other and the problem-solving gestures, to develop understanding of the connections between the gestures;
7. articulating models of skilful architectural and developer practice (reported in Chapters 4 and 5).

The data was rich in terms of process descriptions and there was potential for much more to emerge from the data than the gestures and metaprocesses that were ultimately presented. A core part of the constructivist grounded theory method is to test

and refine process descriptions (or categories) via comparative analysis. Comparative analysis was relied on throughout the coding process to decipher whether what was emerging was unique to an individual or indeed a theme through the data. The core gestures and metaprocesses presented in Chapters 4 and 5 arose because they were validated in various Examples in the data. Constant comparison of emerging gestures and metaprocesses also uncovered characteristics, relationships and dependencies[28] with each other.

The texts of the architects' and developers' interview data were then reviewed to identify passages that would represent the various gestures identified in the iterative analysis and provide a richness in illustrating the gesture and relationships with other gestures. The primary purpose of this stage of analysis was to demonstrate micro aspects of skilful architectural and developer practice. In framing the gestures and metaprocesses it was necessary to illustrate them in practice. For each gesture that was derived from this analytical process, specific passages were identified as exemplary of the gesture. These passages are presented in the thesis as numbered 'Examples', easily recognised by their formatting in Chapters 4 and 5. The Examples provided clear demonstration of gestures that emerged from the coding of the raw data in the interview transcripts. This part of the analysis was designed to assist comparability and potential applicability between individuals and across practice traditions. Analysis, including the generation of gestures and metaprocesses was considered complete once a working model of architectural and developer practice rich enough to describe processes of 'designing', 'negotiating' and 'problem-solving' to novice practitioners had emerged from iterative analysis of the data. 'Designing' and 'negotiating' emerged as a neat complementary set of metaprocesses which takes place at a coarser resolution than the 'metaprocess of problem-solving' and speaks to the transformation of ideas

[28] 'Dependencies' here refers to the complex and often embedded ways the gestures take place. As illustrated in detail in Chapters 4 and 5, the gestures delineated during analysis often do not exist independent of each other. More commonly, it appears, they come about in a quasi-sequential manner which suggests some kind of dependency on prior processes, hence, the use of the conceptual frame of 'metaprocesses' which describes families of gestures.

into architectural detail and the coalescing of resources that enables realisation of built product.

The outcome of this analysis was the creation of partial models of the microprocesses of architectural and developer practice. The scaffolding of individual gestures in skilful practice into integrative micropractices together with the metaprocesses of problem-solving, designing and negotiating offer a way of understanding architectural and developer practice as an iterative, creative and multisensory process.

3.2.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The research design was approved by the Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee (see Appendix 3).

The invited participants held senior positions, and had good track records and reputations for delivering on promises. They were also known to me in some way, mostly through having worked closely with them in the past. In other words, they were recognised within the property industry and by me personally as senior and skilful professionals. Interest in the research was tested first by phone call and this was then followed by a more formal email invitation (Appendix 4). Those who showed interest were sent a copy of the Information and Consent Form (Appendix 5).

Good rapport with the large majority of participants allowed for a friendly and welcoming interview environment. It is likely this was supported by the respectful focus on skilful practice and my attitude of empathic engagement with participants where possible. Only one incident resulted in a short interview and the data not being useful in analysis. This person had been invited as a result of a referral, and I felt relatively early in the process that as interviewer and interviewee we were not a good fit. This did not discourage me from carrying on with the interview for some time but I recognised tangential responses and was unable to effectively bring the participant back on track, I

thanked them for their time and we came to a mutual appreciation that this kind of inquiry is not easy.

The Information and Consent Form (Appendix 5) detailed the research purpose, data collection methods, personnel contact details, risks and privacy. Interviews were conducted either at the office of the participants or at a café/restaurant close by. An Interview and Observational Protocol was developed to encourage consistency of procedure throughout the interview process and to record notes. On a number of occasions, the participants wanted to share a story but did not want this formally disseminated and were offered time to speak 'off the record'. These instances were audio recorded, but none of the content was used in presentation of the data analysis or synthesis (contained in Chapters 4, 5 and 6).

Consent included giving permission to be (and for their projects to be) directly identifiable in the research findings. During analysis, however, I concluded that if such identifiers were retained in the Examples (refer Chapters 4 and 5) they would distract from the focus on analysis of the gestures and they were removed. The high profile of the participants was considered less important than the descriptions of gestures and implications of metaprocesses.

Given the focus on skilful practice, the risk of offending some with what might be perceived as negative analysis was limited. The entire data set was analysed, but determination of gestures focused in on architects and developers (as opposed to including public planners and project financiers).

At the time consent was requested (just prior to data collection), it was anticipated that up to five interviews per participant would be undertaken. Data analysis and writing took far longer than originally predicted, however, and the data itself turned out to be much richer than anticipated. This resulted in a reduction in the number of interviews originally planned for each participant – the initial one hour long interview per

participant was more than enough to develop partial models of skilful architectural and developer practice.

3.2.7 LIMITING THE SCOPE OF THIS INQUIRY

One of the challenges of phenomenological research is knowing when and how to stop. When is experience, insight and understanding reached sufficient to allow one to draw a worthwhile, robust and defensible conclusion? What limitations and constraints on understanding and representation might be encountered as a result of methodological choices made along the research journey?

The largest methodological limitation in the data is that it comes from self-reporting of skilful practice after the event, rather than an integrated practicing and reflection-in-action approach, in which descriptions are elicited as practicing is taking place. Relying on self-reporting of skilfulness places more reliance on practitioners' capacity to describe their practice accurately. There are some paradoxes here: Schön (1983, 1987) asserts and others agree (Osterman and Kottkamp 1993; Loughran 2002) that practitioners often find knowhow hard to articulate. Conversely, it is usual practice to turn to skilled practitioners for advice. The method applied here addresses the limitations of self-reporting by leading practitioners to explore their tacit knowledge as a felt bodily process in the way Petitmengin-Peugeot's (1999) research illustrates.

There are also limitations arising from relying on grounded theory as a way to frame methodology. Perhaps the most pertinent to raise here is the level of difficulty and time associated with deriving new concepts and conceptual frameworks from within the data. Data analysis (open and focused coding and memoing) took place over many iterations and a number of alternative paths were taken (and subsequently let go of) as part of this process. Writing had a significant subsequent influence on testing and refinement of the gestures and metaprocesses and was in itself an aspect of data analysis as well as synthesis.

3.2.8 INSIDER RESEARCH AND PARTICIPANT PROFILE

As outlined in Chapter 1 (section 1.3.3), this inquiry was pursued after I had held various development management positions within both the private and public sectors. Participants to the research were high profile and/or well-established architects and private property developers who held principal or senior executive positions within their respective organisations. Recruitment of participants was made relatively easy because of these existing professional relationships. This was insider research in the sense that I shared an experiential base with each of the participants (Asselin 2003), that is, involvement in design and delivery processes and being situated within the Australian property industry. In some cases, I had worked closely with participants on development projects. This facilitated the research in ways Corbyn et al. (2009) identified:

> *This insider role status frequently allows researchers more rapid and more complete acceptance by their participants. Therefore, participants are typically more open with researchers so that there may be a greater depth to the data gathered.* (Corbyn, Dwyer and Buckle 2009, p. 58)

Insider research is primarily concerned with the acknowledgement of researcher situatedness in the research setting, and the influence of shared understandings and trust that develop between those working in the same or similar working communities (Costley et al. 2010). This was considered during research design and was one of the reasons that constructivist grounded theory was deployed as a methodological frame. It allowed for the gestures and metaprocesses to emerge from looking closely at the data whilst recognising that the findings are interpretive and co-created. Comparative analysis was used as a means to iteratively test the validity of gestures and metaprocesses against additional samples of raw data. The findings are discussed and illustrated with a series of quotes (refer Chapters 4 and 5), allowing for interrogation of the relationship between the raw data and conceptual framing into gestures and metaprocesses.

Given the seniority and high profile of many of the participants, reputational risk was a potential issue and could have influenced responses to interview questions. Whilst having rapport with many of the participants was helpful in setting a welcoming and friendly atmosphere, it is possible (and at times was clear) that questions regarding the finer grained aspects of one's own professional practice (which one may not have paid much attention to previously) can trigger uncertainty, and demand sensitive on the spot self-inquiry. In cases where participants were hesitant to stay with their own evolving sense of how they do what they do (i.e. the felt sense), they were encouraged to take their time and were given the space they appeared to need. This empathic engagement with participants was informed by Todres' (2012) description of 'the open body' and Gendlin's 'focusing' (2007). Perhaps unsurprisingly, I found that those with whom I had the strongest rapport were also those willing to go deeper with their sense of their own practice.

3.2.9 SKILFULNESS IN THE AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT

The participants were all Australian and working in Australian property development contexts. The Australian urban development context (including sociospatial dynamics) very likely differs substantially from some parts of the world (Healey 2006). Despite this, given the level of abstraction away from the context into gestures and metaprocesses, it is possible that much of what goes on in private sector architectural and developer practice in Australia would be in some way pedagogically applicable or perhaps replicable in other democratic and non-democratic contexts and/or practice traditions.

3.2.10 AN EMPHASIS ON PROCESS RATHER THAN BUILT PRODUCT

This research is an inquiry into what constitutes skilful architectural and developer practice. It is, therefore, an exploration of certain aspects of design and delivery processes and not explicitly an exploration of the relationships of those processes with built outcomes. In other words, the research questions centre on the nature of practice and do not seek to evaluate what is realised by the research participants as built product. With this in mind, whilst there are connections between processes and process

outcomes, the chapters that follow speak with more confidence to design and delivery processes, rather than built form itself. The view taken is that interviewing highly-skilled and successful practitioners is valid when one's overall goal is to understand how to produce higher quality, commercially viable residential, commercial and retail premises.

3.3 SUMMARISING THE RESEARCH FRAMES AND METHODS

This qualitative inquiry was designed to explore skilful architectural and developer (and initially also public planners and financiers) practice and was not intended as an inquiry into the range of practice from novice to expert. Data was collected via semi-structured interviews with high profile and experienced professionals and analysis of the data was undertaken in a constructivist grounded theory manner (influenced by Nicolini's (2012) 'theory-method' package for practice-based research of zooming in and out) that culminated in identification of a number of gestures and metaprocesses. The major limitation of the research pertains to the focus on the Australian context. Building an understanding of, and a way to frame, the intricacies and complexities of skilful architectural or developer practice in relation to public planning in an Australian context is of potential relevance to research into and the practice of architects, developers and public planners more broadly.

4: GESTURES AND METAPROCESSES EMERGING FROM ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE

4.1 WHY ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PRACTICE MATTERS

> *Urban planning is intrinsically concerned with the imagination and desire: what the future city should look like, or the impact of a development proposal on the existing built form, on neighbouring uses and people.* (Hillier and Gunder 2003, p. 226)

Both architects and public sector urban planners (especially urban designers) rely on design skills to deliver quality urban outcomes (Gunder 2011). Architects involved in property development typically pursue design detail at the scale of sites and projects. Urban planners typically attend to urban design at wider precinct scales, and assess concept designs at site and project scales. Urban planners and architects are 'designers' of urban form in the way that they contribute to the expression of public and/or private interests in built product. In their work of planning, regulation and/or architectural design each supports a kind of integration between various stakeholder interests. Skilful architects design to a point of integration between planning aspirations embodied in planning controls and practice and project requirements which is fit for purpose. Skilful planners plan and make policy, and regulate to a point of integration between planning aspirations and private interests which is also fit for purpose. As Jacobs (1961) recognises:

> *… free real estate markets are essential for urban diversity…these markets operating on their own cannot effectively create the textural conditions on which vital places depend.* (Jacobs 1961 in Sternberg 2000, p. 274)

Shared understanding between urban planners and architects is critical to urban planning and architectural practice and to the quality of information, communications and interactions across public-private boundaries. Faulconbridge (2010), building on Wenger (1998), talks of the 'shared repertoire' – that is, reference to the same language, tools, objects and/or routines – through which conversations and negotiated meaning emerge between architects. This research takes Faulconbridge and Wenger's thinking slightly further in looking closely at architectural practice for a 'shared repertoire' with public sector urban planners that may already exist.

Paying close attention to practice in the design process also speaks to the interests of communicative planning. Communicative planners promote careful attention to practice at a fine resolution as a means to understanding and encouraging transformative and democratic planning process outcomes:

> *A communicative approach to knowledge production… maintains that knowledge is not pre-formulated but is specifically created anew in our communication through exchanging perceptions and understanding through drawing on the stock of life experience and previously consolidated cultural and moral knowledge available to participants.* [One] *cannot, therefore, predefine a set of tasks which planning must address, since these must be specifically discovered, learnt about and understood through inter-communicative processes.* (Healey 1992a, p. 153)

Analysing architectural practice at a fine resolution offers to uncover intricacies of design practice which shape urban outcomes. Public sector urban planning aspirations, decisions, policies and plans govern architectural design practice in significant ways. Planning controls are symbolic representations of planning aspirations and whilst important are not all there is to urban governance. Planning practice, interactions and communication at the intersection between urban planning and architectural design are also a critical source of information and influence. As Innes notes:

> *… in communicative planning, information becomes gradually embedded in the understandings of the actors in the community, through processes in which participants, including planners, collectively create meanings.* (Innes 1998a, p. 53)

That is, meaning is created through interaction and characterised as an evolving sense of knowing (Healey 1992; Innes 1998a). This implies that understanding the practice of key urban practitioners, such as architects, may provide insight into the links between planning aspirations and processes, and urban outcomes. In other words, if meaning and knowing are created communicatively (that is through interaction and relationship), an inquiry into architectural practice at a fine resolution such as this may provide insight into how urban planning practice might tackle its own design challenges and so offer some valuable opportunities to reflect carefully on how planning practitioners practice their craft.

This chapter looks closely at architectural practice in order to understand how architects create their designs and bring them to life in architectural detail. As explained in Chapter 3, this inquiry explores the practice of high profile and/or well-established and experienced architects. Architectural design begins with the abstract and conceptual, and ends with detailed drawings that guide construction. Architectural practice involves design thinking processes to empathise, define, ideate, prototype and test (Institute of Design at Stanford 2017). It involves ideation and the creation of meaning, and representation and refinement of ideas or 'images' on plan[29] and in prototypical form. The analysis contained here distils specific characteristics of architectural practice, identifying specific gestures and grouping them as:

(i) interiorly-oriented gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' (referred to here as the 'metaprocess of problem-solving'); and

[29] 'On plan' is a professional phrase used in the development industry to refer to a design that has been represented on a plan.

(ii) interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented[30] gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' (referred to here as the 'metaprocess of designing').

Each set of gestures (i.e. each metaprocess) and each gesture display unique characteristics that the architects interviewed relied on at different points in their design process. The interiorly-oriented gestures have previously been discussed by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999). Drawing on Walkerden (2005), TABLE 4.1 (p. 117) lays out parallels between their approaches. The interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' are oriented towards making. That is, they describe aspects of what thinking leads one to do. The interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'persevering' and 'unwinding' are looking at process *as* decision-making process.

Whilst these gestures are disaggregated in this chapter for the purpose of analysis, it is important to acknowledge that the boundaries between them are not fixed or necessarily easily distinguished in practice. Each of these boundaries should be considered contingent and contextual (i.e. fuzzy and temporary). Defining the gestures as separate and distinct elements is a means to understanding complex intricacies of practice that may otherwise go unnoticed. The analysis that follows does not intend to capture a holistic sense of architectural practice but is focused on the intricacies and complexities of practice in an attempt to better understand the way architectural practice intersects with urban development processes. The distillation of gestures and metaprocesses discussed make contributions by:

(i) mapping interiorly-oriented gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' (oriented towards how thinking happens, referred to as a 'metaprocess

[30] The term 'interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented' is relied on this thesis to convey the notion that these two aspects of practice are happening at one and the same time.

of problem-solving', previously explored by Gendlin 1997a and Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999);

(ii) identifying and mapping interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing' (oriented towards how thinking informs making, and referred to as part of a 'metaprocess of designing'); and

(iii) identifying and mapping interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'persevering' and 'unwinding' (looking at design process as decision-making process, and referred to as part of a 'metaprocess of designing').

Together these metaprocesses and underlying gestures form a partial model of architectural design practice. Such a model offers a way to describe design practice as an experiential and exploratory process of iteratively establishing a connection with the felt sense as a form of knowing and again stepping into the unknown. It foregrounds the notion that the felt sense is pivotal to skilful practice (Gendlin 1997a; Walkerden 2005) and is partial only because one might very well go on in future to delineate additional gestures at either a finer or coarser resolution.

This exploration of architects' practice at a micro-resolution also elicits insights for public sector urban planners working at the intersection between urban planning and architectural design. There is a multiplicity of ways architectural practice can be modelled, but there is wisdom in looking for patterns in the practice of high profile and/or well-established architects as means to describing architectural skilful practice more generally.

> *When we go about the spontaneous, intuitive performance of the actions of everyday life, we show ourselves to be knowledgeable in a special way. Often we cannot say what it is that we know. When we try to describe it we find ourselves at a loss, or we produce descriptions that are obviously inappropriate. Our knowing is ordinarily tacit, implicit in our patterns of action and in our feel for the stuff with which we are dealing. It seems right to say that the knowing is in our action.* (Schön 1983, p. 49)

Knowing-in-action (or reflection-in-action) was foregrounded by Schön as part of his demonstration of the limits of the model of technical rationality which (mis)understands professional knowledge and 'know-how' as the implementation of scientific theory and technique to problems of practice (Schön 1983, p. 30).

> *There is nothing in common sense to make us say that know-how consists in rules or plans which we entertain in the mind prior to action. Although we sometimes think before acting, it is also true that in much of the spontaneous behaviour of skillful practice we reveal a kind of knowing which does not stem from a prior intellectual operation.* (Schön 1983, p. 51)

While Schön (1983) speaks of 'design as reflective conversation with the situation', Forester (1989) refers to 'design as making sense together' (and Bertolini and Clercq 2005; and Till 2005 agree that):

> *This formulation allows us to understand design as action in the face of ambiguity, action that recreates the lived worlds of inhabitants, action that is fundamentally communicative in character.* (Forester 1989, p. 132)

Inquiry into fine resolution characteristics of architectural practice may uncover skills directly relevant and transferable to public sector urban planners potentially enabling them to create room for better integration between public urban planning and private property development aspirations, for example. Additionally, framing planning interests to include aspects of key private sector stakeholders such as architects may offer insight into how planning aspirations, policies and practice are received and affect private development processes of design and delivery which may otherwise be left largely opaque to public planners.

4.2 GESTURES OF PROBLEM-SOLVING IN ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE

The interiorly-oriented microprocesses of this section are the finest-resolution gestures discussed in this research. They are framed by the respective and resonant works of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1996) that is laid out in TABLE 4.1 below, adapted from Walkerden (2005).

> *If you compare the structure of the procedures that Gendlin and Petitmengin-Peugeot have delineated, it is clear that his 'heeding felt knowing' and her 'intuition' are in the same movement genre and that the sequences of movements they have observed are closely aligned. It is not a genre for which there is a well-established, widely used vocabulary, so their terminology is quite different. Their process descriptions can be used as reusable, teachable procedures for 'listening to ourselves' (Gendlin* [2007], *1996; Hendricks 2001).* (Walkerden 2005, p. 181)

TABLE 4.1: MICROPROCESS MODELS OF GENDLIN (1996) AND PETITMENGIN-PEUGEOT (1999)

Note: All the contents of the table are direct quotes. There is some compression to facilitate comparison. Adapted from Table 10.1 'Two schemas for listening to ourselves' (Walkerden 2005, p. 182).

Petitmengin (1999, 59)	Gendlin (1996, 71–5)
Letting go The gesture of letting go, of deep-rooting, of interior self-collecting, and of the slowing down of the mental activity, which makes it possible to reach a particular state of consciousness, the 'intuitive state'.	***Clearing a space*** Begin by taking a minute to just rest and be friendly with yourself inside. See what stands between you and feeling fine. Each one of us carries several problems at a time and it is usually a mix of these. It helps to sort them out in the following way …
Connection The gesture of connection, which makes it possible to enter into contact with the object of the intuitive knowledge (a human being, an abstract problem, a situation …).	***The felt sense*** Pick one of those concerns you found. Whatever you may know about the concern you have chosen, since it is a problem it also has an unresolved edge, a *felt sense* of unease, unresolvedness, or implicit richness that is more than you can fully comprehend. To find this unclear edge do the following … ***Getting a handle on it*** Try to find one word, a phrase, or an image to capture exactly *the quality* of that felt sense. ***Resonating the handle*** If the word, phrase, or image really fits […] there should be a little relief, a bodily signal, that says 'yes (*breathes*) that's it all right'.
Listening The gesture of listening, with an attention that is at the same time panoramic and very discriminating, focused on the subtle signs announcing the intuition.	***Asking*** Now, just as if you did not know anything about it, ask in your body, ask the felt sense itself, what it is. Most people find quick answers coming in from what is already known or can be surmised. Let all thoughts just go by if the felt sense does not stir in response to it. Asking the felt sense takes more time. Before there is any effect there might need to be a whole minute of tapping the unclear felt sense, touching it, perhaps backing off, and then touching it again.
Intuition The intuition itself, of which certain of the subjects have acquired (or acquire during the interview) a sufficiently discriminating consciousness to point out three distinct moments: the moment preceding the intuition, the intuition, the moment following the intuition.	***Receiving*** Whatever comes with a little stirring in the felt sense, please welcome it. To 'receive' in our sense means to let the step be, give it a space to be in, not to reject it, however odd or wrong it may seem in itself. It comes with a little bit of bodily felt release, a breath, a bodily sense that something is right about it, and that is what you want.

The categories assigned to each of the interiorly-oriented gestures discussed in the following pages borrow from this work of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) but the terms used are akin to, but not identical to their terms (refer TABLE 4.1 above for respective definitions). They are 'letting go' akin but not identical to Petitmengin-Peugeot's 'letting go' and Gendlin's 'clearing a space', 'connecting' (akin but not identical to Petitmengin-Peugeot's 'connection' and Gendlin's 'the felt sense'), 'listening' (akin but not identical to Gendlin's 'asking' and Petitmengin-Peugeot's 'listening') and 'receiving' (akin but not identical to Petitmengin-Peugeot's 'intuition') and Gendlin's 'receiving'. The following table shows how these microprocesses have been organised and deployed in this research.

TABLE 4.2: RECONCILING THE NAMING OF THE GESTURES: THESIS, GENDLIN (1996) AND PETITMENGIN-PEUGEOT (1999)

Gestures	**Gendlin (1996)**	**Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999)**
'letting go'	clearing a space	letting go
'connecting'	the felt sense	connection
'listening'	asking	listening
'receiving'	receiving	intuition

The discussion of these gestures is submitted as an exposition of aspects of interiorly-oriented architectural knowhow. It is the beginning of a model of architectural design practice intended to provide a scaffold for novice architects and/or those without more formal design training (such as urban planners) to deal skilfully with ambiguity, uncertainty and the unknown. Each of the gestures is discussed in the following structure:

(i) a brief introduction drawing on the literature where appropriate;

(ii) at least three illustrations of the gesture drawn from the architectural interview data; and

(iii) discussion of at least three quotations, drawing out features that illuminate how and why architects rely on these skills in their design work.

There are still finer resolution aspects of architectural practice that one could go on to explicate (for example, nano skills such as heeding or approaching 'letting go') but the focus of this research is to discuss design gestures starting at the resolution illuminated by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999), and then to discuss more interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures which also emerged from analysis of the interview data.

4.2.1 THE GESTURE OF 'LETTING GO' AND OPENING

Letting go **(Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999, 59)**	***Clearing a space*** **(Gendlin 1996, 71–75)**
The gesture of letting go, of deep-rooting, of interior self-collecting, and of the slowing down of the mental activity, which makes it possible to reach a particular state of consciousness, the 'intuitive state'.	Begin by taking a minute to just rest and be friendly with yourself inside. See what stands between you and feeling fine. Each one of us carries several problems at a time and it is usually a mix of these. It helps to sort them out in the following way …

Note: Adapted from Table 10.1 'Two schemas for listening to ourselves' (Walkerden 2005, p. 182) and replicated in TABLE 4.1 above.

Gendlin's 'clearing a space' is a gesture of freeing oneself from being overwhelmed by one's concerns by differentiating between oneself and the concern. Thus, finding a sense of 'feeling fine'. 'Clearing a space':

> *… is the inner act of distancing yourself from what is troubling you but still keeping it before you. You don't go into the problems. You stand back just a little way – far enough so that the problems no longer feel overwhelming, but close enough so that you can still feel them.* (Gendlin 2007, p. 82)

Petitmengin-Peugeot's 'letting go' refers to something similar. 'Letting go' is a gesture of 'slowing down mental activity' in an attempt to create room for the 'intuitive state' to emerge. Both Gendlin and Petitmengin-Peugeot point to the way one may step back from being caught up in or consumed by a situation in order to reflect on something of one's choosing with a clearer connection to oneself. Listening carefully to oneself is

listening carefully to one's situation, and is not a turning away from it (except in special dysfunctional cases).

'Letting go' as it is described here is a gesture of slowing down, heeding one's state of being and releasing built up tensions that are preventing one from finding a connection with oneself. It offers a way for practitioners to open up to change and future possibilities, that is, to the new and the fresh. It may be relied on in two distinct ways: as a more general act of 'letting go' and 'creating a space' for fresh thinking without a particular focus in mind, and a way to make space for fresh thoughts with a particular focus or issue in mind. In both cases, 'letting go' is a way to release tension and instate an active curiosity in one's sense of being.

In architectural practice, 'letting go' is a way to release pressure, stress and anxieties which may hinder creativity and innovation. It is a necessary part of making oneself vulnerable to the unknown, ambiguous and not-yet-resolved which are characteristic of architectural practice. It is a precursor to the gesture of establishing a deeper interiorly-oriented connection with oneself ('connecting'), which then leads one to 'listening' to oneself and others, and on to 'receiving' new and fresh ideas.

4.2.1.1 **Examples of 'letting go' in architectural design practice**

Example 1:

> *[Design] needs to have direction and purpose, but openness and flexibility to not be frightened of divergent thinking. And also I mean I'm of a generation that designs to some degree through drawing. You kind of explore ideas by what is essentially initially an abstract representation which gradually becomes more specific.*

Example 2:

> *…you are never going to get it entirely right, probably, but that sort of accumulated experience does help and it is the experience of yourself and absorbing the experience of others and listening to the experience of others. So there is this really interesting balance between being able to be strong enough and have propositions, have design proposals and ideas and having confidence*

> *in those but enabling them to evolve, not just for the project, but as a body of thinking and work over time.*

Example 3:

> *…it is a little bit about developing intuition around what succeeds and what fails, in a design sense. But it is not just that, it is also having as we said before, a kind of openness to learning those lessons through others and from others and not believe – to be a designer you do need a fair bit of self-belief but because you're doing things that affect people's futures and if you were totally worried about it, you wouldn't be able to do anything…*

There is an opening of a kind to oneself evident in each of the quotes above which is representative of the gesture of 'letting go'. Apparently one needs to approach design with 'openness and flexibility' (Example 1); one needs *'to enable design proposals and ideas to evolve as a body of thinking over time'* (Example 2); and one needs '*to have a kind of openness to learning lessons through others'* (Example 3). There is a quality of being open to new and fresh ideas that is emphasised in each of the quotations above. This is not a 'letting go' as in letting *everything* go including one's sense of self but rather a more strategic 'letting go' of *somethings* (that are clouding one's ability to perform) in order to establish a stronger sense of connection with oneself, and make room for design solutions that fit with one's felt sense and for the project context to take shape.

Opening to the new and the fresh is implied in the reference to 'exploring' in Example 1: "You kind of explore ideas by what is essentially initially an abstract representation which gradually becomes more specific". There is no suggestion here that this practitioner is in control of this process. On the contrary, there is a sense of separation and freedom associated with the notion of 'exploring ideas which gradually become more specific'. It is not through actively pursuing particular paths that designs are resolved but rather through 'exploring' which offers gradual design development and resolution.

Conceptually, 'exploring' is often associated with the idea of travelling into the unknown. This practitioner describes architectural design as a practice of 'exploring

ideas', perhaps, a practice of travelling into the unknown territory of fresh ideas. This characterises architectural practice as a process of continually 'letting go', and opening up to new ideas and fresh thinking, albeit the rate of newness may gradually decline as the design resolves. 'Letting go' in this case is a recurring gestural precursor to the formation of new ideas and, therefore, to the carrying forward of the architectural design process.

It is interesting to note that in Example 1 'direction and purpose' and 'openness and flexibility' appear to play an important role in design. There is a kind of intentionality or leaning toward an outcome reflected in the concepts of 'direction and purpose'. One could assume this includes the kinds of constraints set by urban planning regimes and their policies, design controls and practice. If so, it is worth noting that this participant finds such constraints enabling and critical to the carrying forward of design work in general.

In Example 2, 'letting go' is implied in the description of skilful design as: "the experience of yourself and absorbing the experience of and listening to others". What is particularly interesting about this description is that it highlights 'letting go' as a relational experience – one of experiencing oneself and listening to others. This architect goes on to explicate design as an 'interesting balance between being able to be strong and have ideas' at the same time as 'allowing those ideas to evolve as a body of thinking over time'. This points to design as a process that extends well beyond any one project and into a 'body of [perhaps collective] thinking or work'. 'Letting go' is, therefore, a part not only of one's individual manoeuvring in the context of developing a site specific design but rather a fraction of a broader collective and continuing act of 'letting go'. In other words, one's own body of work is part of a broader emerging body of architectural design thinking. 'Letting go' in this case is also about being a part of the collective act of designing. In a way, it is a blurring of boundaries between self/other, and project/collective body of architectural thinking.

Example 3 is illustrative of 'letting go' in the way that the participant claims an important design skill as 'openness to others': "a kind of openness to learning those lessons through others and from others". According to this architect, design is enacted intrapersonally and socially. Skilful architectural practice is not about learning and applying in isolation from the other, but is a continuum of learning whereby being open to new knowledge and new ways of doing from the outside makes a critical contribution.

Design is not a process of 'letting go' of all concerns but it is about 'letting go' of something: "if you were totally worried about it you wouldn't be able to do anything" (Example 3). This adds a new dimension to the gesture of 'letting go' whereby one must know what to let go of, and be open to, in order to be skilful. It is important to "have design proposals and ideas and confidence in those, but [to enable] them to evolve, not just for the project, but as a body of thinking and work over time". For this architect, having a clear sense of one's ideas implies 'letting go' of other matters and foregrounding and being open to allow that which is worthy of attention to evolve intrapersonally and socially, and in terms of the specific project and the broader body of design thinking. Openness, in this case, is a part of and perhaps also a consequence of 'letting go'.

It is worth noting that the interiorly-oriented gestures distilled from the analysis do not occur in isolation. A number of gestures other than 'letting go' are evident in each of Examples 1, 2 and 3. For instance, in Example 1 'letting go' is linked to the qualities of 'openness and flexibility'; 'connecting' is reflected in "[y]ou kind of explore ideas by what is essentially initially, an abstract representation which gradually becomes more specific"; 'listening' via reference to the notion of 'exploring' and qualities of 'direction and purpose, openness and flexibility'; and 'receiving' with the notion of design as "an abstract representation which gradually becomes more specific". This is important to acknowledge because it offers insight into how these various skills hang together. They are in some cases evident as distinct and separate, and in other cases clearly interrelated and interdependent. This crossing of gestures is not unexpected; it is a clear illustration of the complexity of practice. It appears likely that if one were to interrogate the data

to a finer grain than has been done here (at a nano resolution, for example), one might very well find each of the gestures present inside or alongside each other. It is possible to have:

> *many accurate formulations of a given experience… Among these, many will be equally accurate, although different meanings will result. Hence, not only are various comprehensive symbolizations of one felt meaning possible, but a great variety of other experiences may be drawn in relevantly. The result is very many different ways to symbolize experiences and make them understandable.* (Gendlin 1997a, p. 133)

This also points to some of the difficulty inherent in asking people to describe their practice. It is often only when one senses, feels or experiences a lack of resolution that one becomes aware of a problem and is therefore able to attend to that problem (Gendlin 1997a, p. 73) (hence Schön's (1983) seminal work on reflective inquiry). It is also true that people heed the felt sense do so more or less skilfully (Hendricks 2001). This research is into skilful practice and the skill level of participants in this respect is relatively high.

4.2.1.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'letting go'**

It appears from Examples 1, 2 and 3 that the process of 'letting go' is critical to design work. It offers a way for architects to travel into the unknown and explore new and fresh ideas, which is characteristic of design. For these participants, 'letting go' is a way to make room for 'listening' to oneself, including 'connecting', and also 'listening' to others. One can see from this analysis that there is complexity in architectural practice at a fine resolution, and specifically that there are gestures that are differentiable and that differentiating them helps unpack some of the complexity of architectural practice. 'Letting go', it appears, is often a precursor to 'connecting' and 'listening'. Part of that is a process of knowing oneself and one's ideas (i.e. 'connecting') and then being able to listen to in order to know the ideas of others (i.e. listening). Both 'connecting' and 'listening' appear to rely on the gesture of 'letting go' and the openness that results.

4.2.2 THE GESTURE OF 'CONNECTING' AND ESTABLISHING RELATIONSHIP

Connection The gesture of connection, which makes it possible to enter into contact with the object of the intuitive knowledge (a human being, an abstract problem, a situation …).	***The felt sense*** Pick one of those concerns you found. Whatever you may know about the concern you have chosen, since it is a problem it also has an unresolved edge, a *felt sense* of unease, unresolvedness, or implicit richness that is more than you can fully comprehend. To find this unclear edge do the following … *Getting a handle on it* Try to find one word, a phrase, or an image to capture exactly *the quality* of that felt sense. *Resonating the handle* If the word, phrase, or image really fits […] there should be a little relief, a bodily signal, that says 'yes (*breathes*) that's it all right'.

Note: Adapted from Table 10.1 'Two schemas for listening to ourselves' (Walkerden 2005, p. 182) and replicated in TABLE 4.1 above.

The reason Gendlin talks of the felt sense is clear from the following example that he provides:

> *We often see, sense, and feel* [the felt sense] *first, quite without formulation. For example, we listen to a discussion, then we have something to say. We "know" what we are about to say even without reciting words to ourselves. If we are distracted, we may lose hold of what we were going to say. (And, after groping directly into the concrete felt sense we still have, we can sometimes "get it back": "Oh!", we say, "I've got it back! Just a moment. . . ." We have again what we were about to say, still without words.) We have independent access to an experiential datum that never had formulation.* (Gendlin 1965/1966, pp. 131-132)

This 'experiential datum' is the felt sense of the meaning of something. One has access to experiences of meaning independently of any words or images one may have that express the meaning one feels. Secondly, the felt sense plays a key role experientially in guiding our thinking (and acting). Gendlin continues:

> *In our earlier example, not just any sentences will say what we just recalled we were about to say. Only just certain words will do that. Most other words would not let us feel that we are saying it. How can we tell, considering we never had what we were about to say in words? We can tell because certain words have the directly felt effect I term response. These words carry forward our experiencing. They release, relieve our felt sense of being about to say something. They do not leave this felt datum unchanged. We cannot—in words—copy, represent, or picture what we concretely had as felt meaning. (What would be a picture or representation of that feeling of being about to say something?) Rather, to explicate* [which is what saying the words is doing] *is always a further process of experiencing. It carries forward what we directly felt.* (Gendlin 1965/66, p. 132)

The felt sense of something one is thinking about responds in distinctive ways, and this responding enables us to take our thinking forward. It is evident from this why, at a fine resolution, letting a felt sense form and heeding it plays such a pivotal role in thinking – including designing.

According to Gendlin (1996, pp. 16-24), the felt sense is an experiential process that has eight primary characteristics:

1. the *felt sense forms at the border zone between conscious and unconscious*;
2. *the felt sense has at first only an unclear quality (although unique and unmistakable)*;
3. *the felt sense is experienced bodily*;
4. *the felt sense is experienced as a whole, a single datum that is internally complex*;
5. *the felt sense moves through steps; it shifts and opens step by step;*
6. *a step brings one closer to being that self which is not any content;*
7. *the process step has its own growth direction*; and
8. *theoretical explanations of a step can be devised only retrospectively.*

The felt sense is also fundamentally distinct from emotion, although it may contain emotion (Gendlin 1996).

'Connection' as it is described by Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999, p. 18) "makes it possible to enter into contact with the object of the intuitive knowledge". 'Connection' "is defined by its object, its distance, its source, its sensorial modalities, and the process used" (Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999, p. 23), which is similar in a way to Gendlin's description of explicating the felt sense as an act of symbolic representation.

'Connecting' as it is named here refers to the gesture of finding a symbolic representation that connects well with an aspect of experiencing. One 'resonates the handle' (which may be in the form of images, words and/or feelings) until one arrives at a sense of 'fit' between the aspect of experiencing one is attending to and the symbol/s applied to that particular aspect of experiencing. 'Getting a handle' is like putting a name to a face. One feels the resonance between what one sees and wants to describe and recalls a name that 'fits'. In Polanyi's words:

> *when we make a thing function as a proximal term of tacit knowing, we incorporate it into our body – or extend our body to include it – so that we come to dwell in it.* (Polanyi 2009, p. 16)

'Connecting' with the felt sense or source of experiencing implies a prior gesture of 'letting go' which makes space for one to make contact with oneself and the object of one's attention. 'Connecting' is essential to architectural practice and the way architects come to conceptualise design ideas. It is the process of coming into contact with one's own experiencing as a means to applying meaning and bringing ideas and 'images' to life in one's body-mind and/or on plan.

4.2.2.1 **Examples of 'connecting' in architectural design practice**

Example 4:

> *Hot flushes* [laughter]. *No, it is some of the idea of switching on the light globe. You think, 'that's not a bad idea or that's a' – you get a warm, fuzzy feeling about it and you think it is a good lead. But sometimes it is not a good lead, but you have to be brave enough to recognise that you may be heading down a path that leads to a dead end and you have to retrace the steps or abandon that process in order to solve that problem.*

Example 5:

> *…the number of times I've walked into a project that's a really worthy project or building a space, a landscape, or whatever, it actually gets to you. … "That one." And then you go back and you analyse it and you start to understand the things that are contributing to that.*

Example 6:

> *…it is very intense, it is really interesting. I've been on a lot of juries for awards and so on, and it is amazing that they will have a diverse group of people on the jury, usually not radically diverse because they will be selected by somebody or in some way, each with their own views of the world and different design preoccupations and interests. But when you walk into a project that is a really good project, you just know it. And then you analyse and discuss and so on but design is experiential, we experience things essentially as human beings.*

Examples 4, 5 and 6 each show variations on the process of 'connecting' and markers of times when one senses a connection with the felt sense which points to a way forward. 'Hot flushes', 'warm and fuzzy feelings' and a sensing of 'just knowing' are references to the kind of 'connecting' described independently by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999).

'Connecting' is seen in Example 4 in the various references to felt bodily processes such as 'hot flushes' and 'warm and fuzzy feelings' which are relied upon to describe the architect's sense of knowing when to pursue particular design ideas. It is interesting to note that this practitioner's description of 'connecting' is iterative, evolving and incomplete even as they try to describe their experiencing. At first they refer to 'hot flushes' then to 'switching on a light globe' and then to 'warm and fuzzy feelings'. It is as if they are 'getting a handle' and 'resonating a handle' on their own process. There is a clear symbolic shift with each description – 'hot flushes' which is more a felt bodily process, 'switching on a light' a kind of metaphor for an 'aha' moment and 'warm and fuzzy feelings', another reference to the felt and bodily. This is in a way a representation of the gesture of the felt sense in action. It shows how explicating one's experiencing is at first unclear or tentative and that it is experienced bodily (Gendlin, 1996, pp. 16-24).

This architect's sense of knowing when to pursue (and presumably via absence of such a sense, also when not to pursue) is felt as a bodily process which is then symbolised in words and/or images. Their sense of knowing which step to take next is resonant of Gendlin's description of the felt sense and its expression of a 'life forward direction' or a 'right' next step (1996). As shown in this Example, the gesture of 'connecting' with the felt sense offers a way for practitioners to understand the 'right' next step. What comes from 'connecting' with the felt sense is a marker of a life forward direction, an implied next step.

The second half of Example 4 draws our attention to what may happen next: "But sometimes it is not a good lead, but you have to be brave enough to recognise that you may be heading down a path that leads to a dead end and you have to retrace the steps or abandon that process in order to solve that problem". This architect recognises uncertainty and ambiguity in design work, which is resonant of the description of the design process in Example 1 as 'exploring ideas'. There is no certainty and there is no perfection in the process but rather an evolving sense of knowing. Having a sense of fit (or misfit), for example, is implied in being 'brave enough to recognise a dead end'. Bravery here is associated with not succumbing to some kind of attachment and/or persisting with a particular path when presented with a felt understanding of 'misfit'. Knowing when to 'retrace steps' or 'abandon' an idea implies a gesture of 'letting go'. The sense of 'misfit' is perhaps only noticed or seen when one is willing and brave enough to see a better way. 'Resonating a handle' is held in this statement as well – as one could only know whether to persist, 'retrace' or 'abandon' an idea if one is 'connecting' with a sense of fit (or misfit). This kind of description of design may offer a way of speaking to architects in a way they can relate to when they appear to be veering away, for example, from the instantiation of planning aspirations in architectural detail.

Example 5 is illustrative of the precognitive aspect of 'connecting'. It appears from the quotation that often the bodily sense of a particular building 'gets to you', whether 'good' or 'bad', prior to explicating that sense as 'that one'. This participant is confident

that the felt sense of something 'getting to you' is in some way indicative of design value or 'worth'. It appears from this that only after a sense of knowing has formed via 'connecting' and 'resonating' with the felt sense, does one 'go back and analyse it'. As with Example 4, a 'right' way forward is illuminated by 'connecting' to a bodily sense which somehow qualifies as 'that one' and, thus, worthy of analysis. The felt sense it appears is experienced as a bodily process of feeling prior to representation as 'that one'. It, the felt sense, has its own life forward or growth direction which in this case is pointing to a design worthy of consideration or analysis. It is only after 'connecting' with the felt sense of 'that one' that a theoretical explanation or justification is formulated (Gendlin 1996, pp. 16-24). The first impression of the design is immediate and experienced as bodily or felt. Interestingly, but perhaps not surprisingly, the felt sense comes before cognitive analysis.

Example 6 is another illustration of the precognitive aspect of 'connecting': "But when you walk into a project that is a really good project, you just know it" implies a kind of 'felt knowing' (Walkerden 2005) in a bodily way. This architect implies that there is an added social dimension to such knowing: "it is amazing that they will have a diverse group of people on the jury…But when you walk into a project that is a really good project, you just know it". They find it somewhat curious that despite diverse interests and backgrounds, members of an architectural jury can be, and it appears that in their experience often are, aligned in their intuitions. "You just know it" in this Example is not just a reference to an intrapersonal sense of knowing, but rather points to their experience of a collective sense of knowing. There is perhaps something in being human and in experiencing architectural space and form that is in a broad and/or narrow sense universal or somehow co-experienced.

As is also shown in Examples 4 and 5, it is not an analytical, cognitive or technical sense of knowing that comes first but rather an intuitive and bodily sense of knowing which is explicated and subsequently analysed. 'That one' is in some way representative of 'connecting' with the felt sense and the object of one's attention. It is quite obviously not a technical justification of why or how but rather a marker for a design that is worthy

of consideration and analysis. 'Connecting' as it is described here is a tentative indicator of a path worth pursuing rather than a concrete determination. In the case of an awards process, a singular and/or collective sense of 'that one' is then, presumably, tested alongside other candidates for *best* fit.

As with Examples 1, 2 and 3 under the gesture of 'letting go', the gesture of 'connecting' as it appears here in Examples 4, 5 and 6 is also implicitly not occurring in isolation. In order for one to connect with the felt sense one must be open to that connection, and this implies a prior process of 'letting go'. 'Listening' is of course implied in the notion of sensing felt experiencing. One must be 'listening' to one's own bodily process in order to 'hear' what is being 'said'. Similarly, the notion of 'getting and resonating the handle' implies that one's description of 'the handle' (as a symbolic representation of the felt sense) is made possible through the gesture of 'receiving'.

4.2.2.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'connecting'**

The gesture of 'connecting' with the felt sense illuminates a way forward. Examples 4, 5 and 6 illustrate different experiences of 'connecting' and the ways this is experienced first as a bodily process – 'hot flushes', 'warm and fuzzy feelings' and 'knowing', for example. It is also clear from these descriptions that the felt sense is 'unclear', 'experienced bodily', 'opens step by step', 'has its own growth direction' and that 'theoretical explanations can only be devised retrospectively' (Gendlin 1996, pp. 16-24). It is also clear that architectural practice relies greatly on the gesture of 'connecting' to provoke the formation of design ideas (which allows for subsequent 'testing' and evaluation). After 'letting go' and 'clearing a space' one is primed to 'connect' with the felt sense and 'get a handle on' (or come to terms with) the 'right' next step. The two gestures of 'letting go' and 'connecting' and the two that follow – 'listening and 'receiving' – appear to take place iteratively. There is a temporal and sequential logic to how they come about but this does not appear to be fixed.

4.2.3 THE GESTURE OF 'LISTENING' TO ONESELF AND OTHERS

Listening	***Asking***
The gesture of listening, with an attention that is at the same time panoramic and very discriminating, focused on the subtle signs announcing the intuition.	Now, just as if you did not know anything about it, ask in your body, ask the felt sense itself, what it is. Most people find quick answers coming in from what is already known or can be surmised. Let all thoughts just go by if the felt sense does not stir in response to it. Asking the felt sense takes more time. Before there is any effect there might need to be a whole minute of tapping the unclear felt sense, touching it, perhaps backing off, and then touching it again.

Note: Adapted from Table 10.1 'Two schemas for listening to ourselves' (Walkerden 2005, p. 182) and replicated in TABLE 4.1 above.

The gesture of 'listening' is a process of priming oneself to pay attention to what may come from 'connecting' with and subsequently 'receiving' the felt sense. Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) describes 'listening' as a kind of soft interior focus – a panoramic and inclusive attention to one's interior process. For Gendlin (1996), 'listening' occurs in consort with 'asking': he describes a kind of dialogue with the felt sense using open-ended questions. "Asking the felt sense is somewhat similar to trying to recall something you have forgotten, where there remains only a felt residue of it" (Gendlin 1996, p. 74). 'Asking' is not an act of imposing existing understanding onto a situation but rather about turning toward the felt sense with an attitude of friendliness and curiosity and 'listening' to what comes from the implicit intricacy. It is a gesture of asking one's felt experiencing – a more subtle and holistic dimension than can ever be articulated – about a particular issue or problem as a means to finding some kind of resolve, at the least, a stirring or a subtle felt shift which points to the next step. There is openness implied in 'listening' which points to a prior gesture of 'letting go'. 'Connecting' with the felt sense is also implied as one can only begin 'listening' once one has established contact with the felt sense. 'Listening' is a gesture of evenly poised attention and bodily scanning which begins after 'letting go' and 'connecting' and before 'receiving'.

4.2.3.1 **Examples of 'listening' in architectural design practice**

Example 7:

> *What happens when you try to resolve something and you keep on coming back at issues where it doesn't resolve without it being kind of – and at that point you say, "I don't know"? The concept or the idea may not be right in this circumstance. It may be a great concept, but it may not be the right one or may need some adjustment or redefinition, and you begin to recompose it. The sense is right but the kind of the manifestation of it is not right. And so, you don't try and plug a square peg in a round hole. If you can't get it in, you hold back. And so, when you're designing, you've got a listening process, continual listening process, and so you've, from the many voices, whether it's your own team, whether it's clients and that, and so you've got to be attuned to that.*

Example 8:

> *…the commencement for me is always trying to – if you're trying to draw it out of the source, you've got to understand that and you've got to be able to explain that and I think when you do, you've got a much better chance of bringing people along. As I said,* [design] *is not just bringing people along with it, then also charting the course to some degree.*

Example 9:

> *…if I was drawing a diagram of design thinking, you sort of start at a genesis of a circumstance and with that … it kind of broadens out to a whole lot of other influences that come in and then, they kind of start to shape your thinking and you hone it into an outcome. And little things happen that spark something and you might jump a little bit here and jump a little bit there, but it's a sort of continuous preoccupation I'd say, about searching for an answer.*

Phrases such as 'the sense is right but the kind of the manifestation of it is not right' (Example 7), 'the commencement is… trying to draw it out of the source' (Example 8) and 'you sort of start at a genesis of a circumstance' (Example 9) each show aspects of 'listening' to the felt sense. They also point to an experiencing of design thinking. What is interesting here is that each of the participants consider this to be somehow distinct from themselves. They refer to it as 'the sense', 'the source' and 'a genesis', for example, which appears resonant with the felt sense.

The statement “you keep on coming back at issues where it doesn't… The concept or the idea may not be right in this circumstance” (Example 7) is a broad description of ‘listening’. Here a lack of resolution demands an iterative process ‘coming back at issues’. Implied in this is ‘listening’ to a sense of knowing that a particular issue is unresolved or does not fit. In some cases this problem may be obvious as in a particular proposal simply does not work (does not fit the project brief, for example), or it may be more subtle as in the proposal just does not feel ‘right’. In this statement, the kind of knowing appears to be more like the latter: “[t]he sense is right but the kind of the manifestation of it is not right”. This points directly to a lack of fit between ‘the sense’ (akin to something like the felt sense) and the manifestation (i.e. an attempt at symbolic representation of ‘the sense’ on a plan). They make the comment that “you don’t try to plug a square peg in a round hole” – a commonly accepted metaphor for misfit. This architect is sensitive to the feel that something is ‘not right’ and refers to the act of ‘holding back’ as an important part of solving the problem or finding a fit. In this case, as in Gendlin’s description of problem-solving, the felt sense (or ‘the sense’) that they return to is richer and more specific than the symbolic representation on a plan (1997a, p. 64). The next process step in solving the problem is ‘listening’: “when you're designing, you've got a listening process, continual listening process… and so you've got to be attuned to that” (Example 7). Importantly for this architect, there is something in continually ‘listening’ to ‘the sense’ and to the ‘many voices’ that offers a more complete appreciation of the kind of design that might work.

In Example 8, ‘listening’ is implied as a way to commence design work: “the commencement for me is always trying to – if you're trying to draw it out of the source”. ‘The source’ in this instance appears to refer to a phenomena akin to the felt sense – “a physical sense of something, of meaning of implicit intricacy” (Gendlin 1996, p. 63). The architect’s practice to begin a design is to try and draw it – the design – out of ‘the source’. This implies a kind of ‘listening’ to ‘the source’ and is similar to the way Petitmengin-Peugeot describes paying attention to the subtle signs ‘announcing the intuition’. As with Example 7, a distinction is made between self and ‘the source’. The

ideas are not coming from the architect themselves but rather from something they consider to be distinct and separate.

'The source' has its own existence in much the same way as Gendlin describes the felt sense as a process which has 'its own growth direction' (Gendlin 1996, p. 24). The dynamic character of 'the source' implies that an iterative process of 'listening' is necessary if one is to heed the 'right' next step. 'Listening' to felt experiencing cannot be completed because the felt sense is tied to the present and the whole of a situation, which implies one's involvement and attention on that situation in this moment and the next moment and so on. The gesture of 'listening' may not be just about commencement but rather more faithfully characterised as an iterative and persistent process of 'trying to draw out' (the design, for example) – of oscillating between the felt sense and one's attempt to symbolically represent the felt sense on plan as the situation evolves.

The notion that design thinking starts "at a genesis of circumstance" (Example 9) is interesting because – as shown in Example 7 with 'the sense' and Example 8 with 'the source' – it reiterates the ideas as coming from something outside of oneself. The quote from Example 9, "It broadens out to a whole lot of other influences that come in and then, they kind of start to shape your thinking and you hone it into an outcome" implies a kind of opening up and 'listening' to a range of influences. It appears that those influences or external forces that "shape your thinking" are somehow critical to carrying design forward. Clearly one must be 'listening' for such influences if one is to hear them. The reference to 'jumping a little bit here and a little bit there' is also interesting because it implies that the process is not always able to be explained in a linear or analytical fashion and that some of the process steps are surprising and/or unexpected. Both 'listening' and 'receiving' are implied in the moments of 'spark' and 'jumping' which suggest a visceral or felt bodily response, perhaps linked with excitement, which is transformed into the design. "It's a sort of continuous preoccupation I'd say, about searching for an answer" (Example 9) infers a kind of leaning toward a resolution and this implies 'listening'.

4.2.3.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'listening'**

The gesture of 'listening' relies on prior gestures of 'letting go' and 'connecting' to establish a still and alert state of receptivity. 'Listening' is a way for architects to prepare themselves to receive information interiorly (a richer understanding, for example). 'Listening' implies preparing oneself to hear more from the felt sense (referred to in Examples 7, 8 and 9 respectively as 'the sense', 'the source', 'a genesis'). There is a relational quality to 'listening' which implies opening oneself through 'letting go' and 'connecting', asking and leaning towards an answer. It is about bringing an interiorly-oriented sensitivity to bodily processes to the fore and allowing one's more analytical process to subside. 'Listening' is a process of opening oneself up to 'receiving' new ideas and fresh thinking.

4.2.4 THE GESTURE OF 'RECEIVING' THE FELT SENSE

Intuition	***Receiving***
The intuition itself, of which certain of the subjects have acquired (or acquire during the interview) a sufficiently discriminating consciousness to point out three distinct moments: the moment preceding the intuition, the intuition, the moment following the intuition.	Whatever comes with a little stirring in the felt sense, please welcome it. To 'receive' in our sense means to let the step be, give it a space to be in, not to reject it, however odd or wrong it may seem in itself. It comes with a little bit of bodily felt release, a breath, a bodily sense that something is right about it, and that is what you want.

Note: Adapted from Table 10.1 'Two schemas for listening to ourselves' (Walkerden 2005, p. 182) and replicated in TABLE 4.1 above.

The gesture of 'receiving' follows 'letting go', 'connecting' and 'listening'. Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) describes this gesture as 'the intuitive state'. Gendlin (1996) calls this 'receiving', and points to a stirring or sense of release in the felt sense as an indicator of 'receiving'. An example of this is the way in which one experiences, bodily, a kind of easing or sense of comfort when something that one has had on the tip of one's tongue is remembered: our feeling of knowing shifts with a release of tension. To receive is to 'let the step be', even if it seems puzzling or unrealistic; 'receiving' is heeding the felt sense. What may start as a stirring in the felt sense is then resonated with symbolic representations such as words or images. This process of 'getting a handle' in order to

make sense of 'receiving' implies gestures of 'letting go' and 'connecting' (i.e. 'getting a handle' and 'resonating the handle') until one finds a point of integration between what is being received from the felt sense and the symbolic representations being applied. Having an 'aha!' moment, when one experiences an insight coming, is an example of the kind of process Gendlin and Petitmengin-Peugeot are pointing to here. Less dramatic instances of this kind of shift are relatively common. 'Letting go' is an experiential process of clearing a space, 'connecting' is a process of coming into contact with the felt sense; 'listening' is a process of observing the felt sense; and 'receiving' is a process of coming to terms with or finding meaning in one's experiencing of one's felt sense more clearly or explicitly. 'Receiving' is a period of intuition that helps to illuminate the next step.

4.2.4.1 Examples of 'receiving' in architectural design practice

Example 10:

> *It's very satisfying and it gives you more – it builds a much more positive attitude towards the next line and the next line and the next line. And sometimes this might be the last 10% of the time to do a design, that it's all coming together in that last 10%. The first 90%, you're really casting the net wide for solutions and once you start getting some lines that are really working, the solutions come very quickly towards the end.*

Example 11:

> *I suppose it's the sort of an unknown ingredient in your own mind of what actually triggers something that gives you an idea… intuition is really almost the God-given creative process. What makes a painter a good painter or what makes an architect a good architect is not easily explained, why things can happen in an almost metaphysical way that gives rise to a whole series of intellectual reactions that are then tested against a rationalism.*

Example 12:

> *Because it might be* [that] *external solutions say, "Try a circle. Try a square. Try a triangle," but somewhere inside, the interconnection between what's happening in your creative mind and what's going down on the paper might end up with a spiral. It's not because you've enunciated spiral – now I'm going to go with spiral – it's just because it's coming as part of a solution that's not just coming because I've done this project three times before. It's coming as part of a thinking and*

> *creative process. Yes, it might be listening to that intuition. Or it might be part of the learned system of testing. Or it's a combination of both.*

Examples 10, 11 and 12 each refer to a kind of travelling into the unknown, resonant of Example 1 and 'receiving' in a nonlinear and/or incremental fashion. Example 10 is a description of the design as a process of 'casting the net wide' and 'solutions coming in the last 10%'. The sense that what comes fits, resolves, is also a very important part. Example 11 draws attention to an unknown ingredient in the mind which "triggers something that gives you an idea". Example 12 reiterates the nonlinearity of the design process (Pallasmaa 2009) with reference to 'receiving' as 'trying a circle' and 'trying a square' and 'ending up with a spiral'. Each of these Examples implies a kind of step by step character of knowing in design which is resonant of Gendlin's description of 'receiving' as being open to whatever comes:

> *Try not to let that critical capacity to knock out that first little step. To be sure you will not know for a while if it is real, if it is right, if it is realistic...* (Gendlin 1996, p. 74)

It is also resonant of Schön's reflection-in-action and description of musical performance as designing (see Schön 1987, pp. 175-216).

Example 10 is a description of the microprocess of 'receiving' in the context of drawing design lines on a page: "It's very satisfying and it gives you more – it builds a much more positive attitude towards the next line and the next line and the next line". This architect points to a sense of feeling satisfaction when a line feels 'right'. The sense of knowing comes iteratively with an urge (underpinned by satisfaction) to draw the next line and the next line. Knowing how comes in some way from the prior line which implies a prior process of 'receiving' and of finding a symbol to represent what has been received. When this sense of fit (or satisfaction) presents, "it builds a much more positive attitude towards the next line and the next line and the next line". This sense of fit is in a way building confidence in the design.

“The first 90%, you're really casting the net wide for solutions and once you start getting some lines that are really working, the solutions come very quickly towards the end” (Example 10). This is similar to the description of design in Example 1 as: “abstract representation which gradually becomes more specific’, and in Example 9 by: “it kind of broadens out to a whole lot of other influences that come in and then, they kind of start to shape your thinking and you hone it into an outcome” although this process description suggests that it is only *because* a sense of resolution is coming that this happens to be the last 10%. There is a sense in this case that knowing arises exponentially as the design progresses to a close. The sense of resolution comes quite late in the process, perhaps unsurprisingly, and this is interesting because, in the cases where this is so, one’s ability to deal with uncertainty is key. It points to the importance of such a skill in architectural practice. In turn it reflects a substantial reliance on attuning oneself to an ongoing and iterative sense of ‘right’ in the face of uncertainty.

In response to a question on where ideas originate, this participant refers to “a God-given creative process” where “an unknown ingredient in your own mind of what actually triggers something that gives you an idea” (Example 11). A “metaphysical way” gives “rise to [a] series of intellectual reactions which are tested against a rationalism”, which implies that ‘receiving’ comes from somewhere not easily explained. Perhaps it does not need to be. One does not need know how to articulate what one does in order to be skilful (Schön 1983). The participant implies here that ideas come into one’s consciousness from somewhere else, as opposed to being consciously constructed. The coming of the idea is inexplicable because ordinary vocabulary and commonplace models of the mind, like ‘the mind is a container’, seem to imply that such a coming is impossible. ‘Receiving’ is experientially very familiar, though rarely remarked on, and tricky to theorise. Notwithstanding this, it is welcomed as a means to forming ideas and then translating these onto a plan.

With Petitmengin-Peugeot’s handle of the coming of intuition to the fore, Example 12 illustrates how the process of ‘receiving’ is uncontrollable, often unanticipated and cannot be forced: “Try a circle. Try a square. Try a triangle," but somewhere inside, the

interconnection between what's happening in your creative mind and what's going down on the paper might end up with a spiral. It's not because you've enunciated spiral – now I'm going to go with spiral – it's just because it's coming as part of a solution… It's coming as part of a thinking and creative process". Whilst the architect may 'receive' 'try a circle' and 'try a square', the unintended and perhaps 'fitting' consequence may be 'a spiral'. The design process is characterised as oscillating between ideating and drawing. This implies prior gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting' and 'listening', as one cannot be 'receiving' unless one has let go, is connected and is listening[31]. The architect receives a spiral "as part of a solution" as if the 'circle' and the 'square' were necessary but non-scripted steps to arrive at a spiral. This implies that the architect has a sense of 'right' in relation to the circle and the square, a trust in the steps which indirectly form part of the solution. This description speaks again to the importance of the gestures of 'listening' and 'receiving' (and 'letting go' and 'connecting'). More clearly than any other Example so far, however, it points to the importance of being faithful to an evolving process of not knowing. Something is guiding the architect through a square and a triangle to arrive at a spiral, but the form of these designs are not recognisable until the spiral has come. This is important to acknowledge because it implies that there is an evolving sense of the 'right' or a needed next step despite one not being clear about its contribution to the solution. There is an implied trust in the steps of one's process, notwithstanding that those steps may not have a clear and explicit relationship with the final design. This is resonant of Gendlin's (1996, p. 24) process description of the felt sense as unclear and fuzzy at first (though unique and unmistakable) and the way that it shifts and implies forward movement, step by step.

[31] Notice how 'having an aha moment' has the same structure described here. It is just that in calling something an 'aha moment' the emphasis is on the last part of the process – where the fresh content arrives in useable form as opposed to what is described here where the emphasis broadens to include the processes leading up to the 'aha'.

4.2.4.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'receiving'**

The gesture of 'receiving' as it is described here is resonant of Gendlin's explication of an unclear and fuzzy edge of awareness. Examples 11, 12 and 13 suggest in different ways that 'receiving' is in some way tied to foregrounding a relationship with the unknown. There is an implied trust in the process of 'receiving' despite not being able to explain precisely how this process happens, although they each know that it works. The gesture of 'receiving' and the design process itself rests significantly on the process of travelling into the unknown. 'Listening' and 'receiving' are about paying attention and leaning toward a resolution iteratively and with sensitivity to the often nonlinearity of the design process (Pallasmaa 2009). It appears that 'receiving' ideas is grounded in being open to not knowing but somehow sensing potential of some kind. Architects rely on a source and a process they are not able to explain analytically yet they remain open and faithful to such a process because it works. Whilst there are certain ways to tempt a process of ideation – through gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting' and 'listening', for example – it cannot be forced and is sometimes 'received' in unanticipated ways.

4.3 GESTURES OF DESIGNING IN ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE

A number of interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures were uncovered by looking at the architectural interview data with a slightly coarser resolution lens than that applied to the interiorly-oriented gestures discussed in the previous section. These additional gestures include 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' and capture aspects of how architects generate ideas and represent ideas in plan**.** Ordinary practice involves paying attention to these processes on an exceptions basis. To pay attention to them with a view to doing them more skilfully, and inviting the emergence of fresh ideas deliberately, is to integrate creativity and problem-solving skills more effectively into one's practice. One can be managing one's own finer resolution or interiorly-oriented gestures whilst one is imagining, testing, etc. They encompass the broadly accepted design thinking processes of empathise, define, ideate, prototype and test (Institute of Design at Stanford 2017).

This section foregrounds inner (i.e. interiorly-oriented) and outer (i.e. sociomaterially oriented) facets of experiencing as a way to understand the process of transforming ideas to plan form. [32] The gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' discussed earlier are primarily microprocesses of empathising, defining and/or ideating, and of allowing an understanding of the felt sense to form. It is where "we concentrate on the felt meaning itself (thus, employing direct reference) and as a result of this concentration upon it, symbols present themselves" (Gendlin 1997a, p. 107). Once the felt sense has form that is recognisable and is symbolically represented with images and/or words, it is ready for representation or is represented on plan.

In contrast, the interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' are microprocesses of the design thinking processes of empathising, defining, ideating, prototyping and testing (Institute of Design at Stanford 2017), whereby architects seek to draw out aspects of the felt sense into plan form. Architectural design viewed in this way is an iterative and evolving process of concentrating on inner and outer aspects of experiencing. The gestures discussed here do not exclude those discussed earlier, they simply bring engagement with the outside or exterior world more into focus. In many instances, the finer resolution interiorly-oriented gestures discussed in the previous section contribute to each of these coarser resolution interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures. That is, 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving', taken together, is, or can be, a micropractice embedded within these interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures multiple times.

[32] This thesis foregrounds practice at a fine resolution as a way to better understand the relationships and dependencies between practitioners and their working environments including material conditions. The gestures discussed and uncovered in Chapters 4 and 5 are not divorced from material conditions but rather discussed in a way – from fine grained, interiorly-oriented first-person perspectives – that is unusual which perhaps leaves materiality more in the background than one might expect. It is important to note, however, that the gestures themselves are observed as interactions with opportunities and constraints provided by the material conditions within which practitioners find themselves operating.

The gestures introduced in this section represent different ways architects move between the felt sense, ideas and project context as they lean toward architectural detail and resolution. Design, of course, does not take place in isolation and the Examples discussed illustrate some of the ways architects interact socially and/or materially. As with the interiorly-oriented gestures, this is not an exhaustive account but rather an exposition of some critical strands of skilful architectural practice. The gestures explored here clarify aspects of what it means to be a skilful designer and are particularly resonant with Pallasmaa's description of the design process:

> *A creative insight in architecture is rarely an instantaneous intellectual discovery that could reveal a complex entity in its complete and finite resolution in a moment; neither is it a linear process of logical deduction. Most often the process begins with an initial idea that is developed for a while, but soon the concept branches out to new paths, and this pattern of criss-crossing trajectories grows ever denser through the process itself. Design is a process of going back and forth among hundreds of ideas where partial solutions and details are repeatedly tested in order to gradually reveal and fuse a complete rendition of the thousands of demands and criteria, as well as the architect's personal ideals of coordination and harmonization, into a complete architectural or artistic entity.* (2009, pp. 107-108)

4.3.1 THE GESTURE OF 'IMMERSING' ONESELF IN THE PROJECT CONTEXT

Immersing
The gesture of 'immersing' refers to the way architects collect and absorb information as a means to 'getting and resonating a handle on' project scope and conditions, and commencing the process of ideation. At the early stages of design, architects seek out contextual data in an attempt to understand project opportunities and constraints, and promote design thinking. 'Immersing' is a process of coming to terms with project conditions and key stakeholder interests. It is a process of empathising, defining and ideating, and relies at various times on interiorly-oriented gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving'.

In comparison to the interiorly-oriented gestures, 'immersing' is perhaps most resonant with 'listening' and 'receiving'. 'Immersing' entails both searching ('listening') and finding ('receiving') context relevant information in an attempt to understand the scope and opportunities of a project. Unlike 'listening' and 'receiving', however, which take place at a fine resolution, 'immersing' can be seen at a coarser resolution and appears

across wider segments of time. It relies to an extent on the gestures of 'letting go' and 'connecting' as precursors to 'listening' and 'receiving'. It is a gesture of data collection – of actively pursuing new and fresh information – which, once assimilated into a broader sense of knowing, enables one to better understand the project context and resolve the design. 'Immersing' may include practices such as reviewing the brief, walking the site, gathering applicable planning controls, and property market forecasting, for example. It is with this gesture that architects cast their net wide, gather and analyse site relevant information which enables them to meet the needs of various key stakeholders. In the words of Pallasmaa (2013, p. 71):

> *… during the design process, the architect gradually internalises the landscape, the entire context, and the functional requirements as well as his/her conceived building: movement, balance and scale are felt unconsciously through the body as tensions in the muscular system and in the positions of the skeleton and inner organs.*

4.3.1.1 Examples of 'immersing' in architectural design practice

Example 13:

> *My approach to design is both rational on the one hand and intuitive on the other. I believe in judgement but I also strongly believe in sourcing design thinking and absorbing myself in the circumstance of a project and allowing the design thinking to be informed by and emerge somewhat organically from that sort of absorption.*

Example 14:

> [Designing] *is about your whole kind of personal experience. Obviously, there is a making but it is in your research. It is in your scholarship. It is in the way that you put yourself into the world to actually listen to it, hear things, encounter things, and then reflect on that, in terms of where you want to take things. As you get older you can begin to distil that, and categorise it, and organise it, and make sense of it, which you can't when you are necessarily younger. It is all an experience, that kind of thing.*

Example 15:

> *So, I'm kind of making buildings from amplifying or understanding the experience of not place but circumstance in a situation, and how you make that evident and enjoyable in the way that you conduct sequence* [that is, the way you organise

> themes and elements in space]*, and then you kind of suspect that idea that Australia has been making itself, and there's no limit on what you can do in Australia beyond what your imagination can allow you do and what your personal commitment to confront the issues which confront you to stop you* [from achieving your goals].

The process of leaning into and absorbing information from the context, and then seeking to make sense of that and allow it – the new understanding – to shape the design runs through Examples 13, 14 and 15. In 'immersing', one allows oneself to 'be absorbed in the circumstance of a project' (Example 13), 'puts oneself into the world to actually listen to it, hear things, encounter things, and then reflect on that…' (Example 14) and 'makes buildings from amplifying the experience of not place but circumstance in a situation'. 'Circumstance' in this case refers to something much richer than 'place' in its narrower sense as a geographic locale.

Example 13 contains a rather abstract definition of 'immersing' as "sourcing design thinking and absorbing myself in the circumstance of a project and allowing the design thinking to be informed by and emerge somewhat organically from that sort of absorption". It appears that this architect relies on 'immersing' to somehow prompt ideas. This is a nonlinear process and the ideas "emerge somewhat organically from that sort of absorption". New ideas are in some way stimulated by new information, and the process of 'immersing'. This is resonant of the way 'listening' provokes 'receiving'. 'Immersing' is much like 'listening and receiving' except that in 'immersing', the architect is seeking new information not only interiorly, in allowing the felt sense to form, but also sociomaterially (i.e. out in the world). The processes of 'listening' and 'receiving' are extended across larger segments of time as more information is gathered and absorbed.

Part of 'immersing' involves seeking and 'receiving' new information about the project context – such as soil conditions, solar access, political atmosphere, etc. The gesture of 'immersing' extends beyond the bounds of interiorly-oriented experiencing and into the sociomaterial. It is about 'listening' not just to oneself but also to other people and external sources of information. 'Letting go' and 'connecting' are also implied here, as

they are precursors to ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’. ‘Immersing’ is, therefore, about ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’ from the felt sense (i.e. interiorly) in the context of new sociomaterially oriented information is gathered over time. As immersing proceeds, one’s felt sense of what the design should be evolves. It is in a way, a non-analytical microprocess of empathising-ideating.

“[Designing] is about your whole kind of personal experience. Obviously, there is a making but it is in your research. It is in your scholarship” (Example 14). This architect relies on ‘immersing’ in a similar way as that described in Example 13. They propose that ‘making’ design is in the ‘research’ which resonates with the notion that ideas come somehow from ‘absorption’ of new information (Example 13). “It is in the way that you put yourself into the world to actually listen to it, hear things, encounter things, and then reflect on that, in terms of where you want to take things”. This statement refers to ‘listening, hearing and encountering the world’ which is resonant of ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’, and like Example 13 implies sociomaterial interaction. “As you get older you can begin to distil that, and categorise it, and organise it, and make sense of it, which you can't when you are necessarily younger. It is all an experience, that kind of thing” (Example 14). ‘Immersing’ in this Example is a process of interpretation. One learns to ‘distil, categorise, organise and make sense of’ the new information in the context of the project. This architect reaches out beyond and then comes back to their inner experiencing as they seek to ‘put themselves into the world’ and then ‘make sense of it’. Their design method is a process of ‘listening’ and ‘making sense’. This is resonant of Forester’s (1989, pp. 119-133) discussion of design as a process of ‘searching for a satisfactory solution’ by ‘making sense together’ (‘together’ meaning socially).

Example 15 extends the notion that much of the ‘making of a design is in the research’ (refer Example 14), that is, in the process of paying careful attention to the context within which one is working. This statement refers to ‘making [as in designing] buildings’ as “amplifying or understanding the experience of not place but circumstance in a situation”. This implies that this architect relies on ‘immersing’ themselves in circumstance as a way to gather information and build understanding of project context.

They then 'amplify' this understanding by making it "evident and enjoyable in the way [they] conduct sequence" (i.e. organise themes and elements in the subject space). That is, they try to demonstrate sensitivity to the project context in their design. Design, in this sense, is brought into the world through a sensitivity to context and representing that sensitivity in the design. 'Immersing' defined in this way is about building an understanding of context as a platform or foundation for designing for example, through gestures of 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding'.

4.3.1.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'immersing'**

'Immersing' is a gesture predominantly at play in earlier phases of design when an understanding of circumstance provides a crucial platform to develop ideas. In the earlier stages of design, 'immersing' encourages architects to 'get a handle on' project context to prompt ideation. 'Immersing' is about building a context sensitive understanding of what kinds of design elements might fit prior to having formed a view or 'image' for the site. The gestures of 'letting go' and 'connecting' are precursors to 'listening' and 'receiving' new information. 'Immersing' is like 'listening' and 'receiving' interiorly-and-sociomaterially, and relies on the gestures described earlier of 'letting go' and 'connecting'. 'Immersing' begins with reaching out into sociomaterial aspects of the world and ends with an inkling of an idea or 'image' which comes interiorly. It is a process of assimilating new knowledge into one's understanding of what might fit in order to provoke ideas. In these Examples, 'immersing' appears as one of the first steps in describing the 'metaprocess of designing'. This does not mean, however, that 'immersing' is only present in the early stages of design. It may come again after a phase of 'imagining' (discussed next) as part of additional research.

4.3.2 THE GESTURE OF 'IMAGINING' THE PROPOSED DESIGN

Imagining
'Imagining' typically follows the gesture of 'immersing' and refers to the way architects provoke an 'image' or felt understanding of design ideas to form interiorly, prior to and as part of, representation on plan. 'Imagining' relies on a precursor of 'immersing' and also finer grained gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving'. It is a phase of body-mind oriented conceptualisation of design

ideas and takes place more radically at the earlier stages of design (such as empathise, ideate). It is, however, relied on at various stages in design right up until the point of completion. In any case, the 'image' or representation is yet to undergo thorough 'testing' for detailed and technical fit.

The gesture of 'imagining' typically follows 'immersing' and is the process of envisioning and coming to terms with ideas either prior to or as part of representation on plan. 'Imagining' enables architects to 'get an early partial handle on' what kind of design solution might fit in the form of an 'image'. They leverage contextual knowledge absorbed during 'immersing' to stimulate an 'image' which often has visual, atmospheric and felt qualities. The experiential process of 'imagining' evolves as architects gather new knowledge (through 'immersing'), assimilate such knowledge and allow their 'image' to respond. It is a process which carries design thinking forward. This is resonant in some ways of a 'reflective conversation' (Schön 1983). Where the prior gesture of 'immersing' is about 'listening' and 'receiving' information about the project context and provoking ideas, 'imagining' is about leaning toward the formation of ideas.

If 'immersing' is a gesture of empathising, defining and ideating, 'imagining' is a gesture of empathising, defining, ideating, prototyping and testing. 'Images' developed through 'immersing' are then formed during a process of 'imagining' which is akin to dynamic involvement between the felt sense and project context. 'Imagining' relies on finer resolution processes of 'listening' and 'receiving', and the precursors of 'letting go' and 'connecting'. It is through 'imagining' that architects 'receive' an 'image' of what might fit. '(Re)imagining' and '(re)immersing' takes place as the 'image' is 'tested' for fit.

Much like the felt sense, 'image' as it is discussed here may at first come as words or images – it refers to an experiential shift in understanding. This is resonant of Gendlin's 'direct reference', or directly referring to the felt sense:

> *In attempting to define it* [the felt experiencing], *you concentrate on your felt sense of its meaningfulness. Words* [or images] *to define it will arise, as it were, from this act of concentration of the felt meaningfulness.* (1997a, p. 91)

'Imagining' is a process whereby architects seek to draw out an 'image' through 'direct reference' to the felt sense. That is, they seek to represent aspects of the felt sense in relationship with the project context either in their imagination or on plan. 'Imagining' is more obvious during the earlier stages of design prior to 'testing.

4.3.2.1 Examples of 'imagining' in architectural design practice

Example 16:

> *…you seek to imagine. We learn to imagine, we learn to draw as a representation of something that is more complete within. I think it is gradually becoming complete in your imagination. Then you represent that and test it, and represent it with others and test it.*

Example 17:

> *I design buildings from the position of how people interact with them when they're within them, how they interact with them around, how the buildings do the opposite – so how buildings interact to people…so, you situate yourself to, as much as you can, imagine the various – you can compose and configure buildings within a series of encounters which you have to imagine yourself being within.*

Example 18:

> *What I say is that you can presence yourself within a situation and you can see it. I don't know how this happens – you can see it. What I do then is that I will work out what we need to go and research. We have that kind of body sense, and we go and research to get as much as we can within the time that we've got – the knowledge of different opportunities or contexts or issues that we're knowing what the problem is, and knowing what the potential is.*

'Imagining' as it is described in Examples 16, 17 and 18 refers to a process of assimilating ideas and bringing those ideas to life on plan. Architects 'seeks to imagine' and "draw as a representation of something that is more complete within" (Example 16), "design buildings from the position of how people interact with them when they're within them" (Example 17) and 'presence themselves in a situation in order to see it' (Example 18). Each of these Examples implies tapping into the imagined experience of a situation in order to draw it. There is a kind of coming to terms with the felt sense or felt meaning

and allowing an 'image' to form in response to that – first in one's body-mind and then on plan.

Example 16 points to 'immersing' as a process of representing something that comes from within: "We learn to imagine, we learn to draw as a representation of something that is more complete within. I think it is gradually becoming complete in your imagination. Then you represent that and test it, and represent it with others and test it". This implies that the 'image' is coming interiorly as experiencing and is resonant of Gendlin's (1997a) characterisation of the felt sense as implicit intricacy of the present. At the same time as this architects draws or seeks to represent felt meaning, their 'image' of what might fit is "gradually becoming complete". That is, the process of representing an 'image' on plan is at the same time an iterative preliminary process of refinement. Their 'imagining' begins and ends as an interactive process of seeking to symbolically represent the felt sense as it responds to information on the project context on plan.

'Listening' is implied in 'seeking to imagine' (Example 16). There is a kind of deliberate interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented leaning toward an 'image' that carries design forward. Drawing as it is described here embodies the notion of 'imagining'. The notion that the 'image' is "gradually becoming more complete within" suggests that the act of drawing is not just an act of representation but in some way also a process of refinement. Presumably, as one draws a line on a page one can 'get a handle on' whether the line feels 'right' as a representation of the 'image' by 'resonating' such an 'image' back on the felt sense. An 'image' does not present itself as complete but rather as a clarifying process step. Once an 'image' has taken form 'within' it becomes a process of 'imagining' and 'receiving' as opposed to 'immersing' or 'listening'.

Example 17 points to a kind of felt sensitivity that architects rely on to design. This architect designs buildings "from the position of how people interact with them when they're within them, how they interact with them around, how the buildings do the opposite". They do this by situating themselves as much as they can within an internal

'image' of the building'. Their 'imagining' is much like that described by Pallasmaa (2009, p. 15):

> *The foremost skill of the architect is, likewise, to turn the multi-dimensional essence of the design task into embodied and lived sensations and images; eventually the entire personality and body of the designer becomes the site of the design task, and the task is lived rather than understood.*

'Imagining' in this Example is about more than the 'listening' and 'receiving' described in Example 16 and extends to a kind of felt experiencing of an 'image' and what may become built product as a way to design. This architect relies on the gesture of 'imagining' themselves within the unbuilt space in advance of architectural plans as a means to refining their 'image'. It is a kind of thought experiment to elicit a sense of the next step or a 'right' way forward, a way of engaging indirectly but empathetically with others in order to qualify design detail. This is somewhat resonant of 'empathetic imagination' as it is described by Pallasmaa (2014).

Example 18 is resonant of Example 17 in the way that it refers to 'presencing oneself in a situation so you can see it'. Despite not being able to articulate how this happens, this architect is confident that they rely on a process of 'presencing' as a means to empathetic imagination in design. This echoes Alexander's (1979, p. xii) description of how to go about a process of developing 'living pattern languages':

> *To work our way towards a shared and living language once again, we must first learn how to discover patterns which are deep, and capable of generating life… We may then gradually improve these patterns which we share, by testing them against experience: we can determine, very simply, whether these patterns make our surroundings live, or not, by recognising how they make us feel… Once we have understood how to discover individual patterns which are alive, we may then make a language for ourselves for any building task we face.*

This architect refers to having a "kind of body sense" which implies an experiential feel for design which provides insight into what research is needed. It is from this 'body

sense' (perhaps akin to the felt sense) and research or 'immersing', that they are able to understand the "different opportunities or contexts or issues" and 'know the problem and the potential'. 'Imagining', to this participant, is a process of situating oneself in aspects of the project context to 'get a handle' on what is possible and insight into a way forward, which in this case is back to a process of 'immersing'.

4.3.2.2 Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'imagining'

'Imagining' is an interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gesture which often follows 'immersing' and involves assimilation of the information gathered (via 'immersing') and moves towards representation of design ideas on plan (via 'imagining'). Some knowledge of the site and/or context is necessary for the gesture of 'imagining' to take place, at least in skilful practice. Such knowledge (gained by the gesture of 'immersing') assists with provoking an 'image' well defined enough to be 'tested' back against the felt. An 'image' for a design come first by way of imagination. Once in a recognisable form, an 'image' is 'tested' experientially through processes included in 'imagining', such as those described in Examples 16, 17 and 18 as 'imagining', 'situating' and 'presencing'. Following this, an 'image' is symbolically referenced in plan form in a process of drawing. 'Imagining' refers to preliminary iterations of interiorly-oriented assimilation, of allowing the felt sense to form as an 'image' - which may be visual or felt – in relation to the context, and symbolic representation, that is 'imagining' and/or drawing the 'image'. This is where "symbol and felt meaning are in parallel, a one-to-one relationship with each other" (Gendlin 1997a, pp. 100-101). Frequently, in the embryonic stages of design, architects move between processes of 'immersing' and 'imagining' in order to develop contextual understanding and an 'image' of what might fit which is later 'tested' against more technical rationality.

4.3.3 THE GESTURE OF 'TESTING' AND REFINING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

Testing
'Testing' is primarily a gesture of representation and refinement whereby contextual knowledge (absorbed during 'immersing') and preliminary ideas (provoked and represented during 'imagining')

are evaluated against project requirements. 'Testing' relies on prior gestures of 'immersing' and 'imagining' as means to generating ideas worth evaluating. 'Testing' is a process of refining architectural plans by comparing preliminary, intuitive and experiential design ideas (coming from earlier phases of 'immersing' and 'imagining') against more sociomaterial and/or technical specifications. It results in a degree of validation or rejection of the 'image' provoked and formed during 'immersing' and imagining'.

The gesture of 'testing' is a process of design development whereby the preliminary and experiential 'image' formed during 'immersing' and 'imagining' is evaluated against various sociomaterial and/or technical requirements. Some form of 'immersing' is implied prior to this 'testing' during which one turns one's attention to the more sociomaterial aspects of design (such as planning controls, project brief, construction budget, structural integrity) which may enable or constrain the 'image' to be built. In a way, one must have been 'immersing' and 'imagining' to an extent to be in a position to begin 'testing'. 'Testing' is a form of risk management during which the architect leans toward refinement and detail as part of delivery of architectural plans. Where 'immersing' is about collecting project relevant data as a way to provoke ideas, 'imagining' is about assimilating the data collected and allowing an 'image' to form, 'testing' Is about refining this 'image' in a way that supports delivery.

During 'testing', architects foreground contextual knowledge, either an existing understanding or through an additional process of 'immersing', and compare this with the 'image'. This is a way of checking whether the 'image' still fits the now more intricate and completely considered context. If it does, one refines the 'image' in a similar direction, and if not, one adjusts the 'image' to better suit the context. This process resonates with Schön's reflective practice description:

> *Because of* [the] *complexity, the designer's moves tend, happily or unhappily, to produce consequences other than those intended…In a good process of design, this conversation with the situation's back-talk, the designer reflects-in-action on the construction of the problem, the strategies of action, or the model of the phenomena which have been implicit in his moves.* (1983, p. 79)

The gesture of 'testing' implies finer grained gestures of 'listening' and 'receiving' (and the precursors 'letting go' and 'connecting'). Both '(re)immersing' and '(re)imagining'

are also implied in 'testing' as architects are prompted either to enrich or unravel portions of the 'image'. During design, architects foreground processes of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' as a means to find a point of integration, a synchronicity, between the felt sense and 'image' they are pursuing. 'Testing' allows architects to prove (or disprove) the appropriateness of their symbolic representation, that is, 'image' in their imagination and/or on plan to themselves and others. It is a process of 'testing' and strengthening design proposals. During 'testing', the 'image' gradually becomes a representation on plan. Testing' is a means to grounding one's 'image' in context as a move toward sociomaterially-oriented built product and echoes Gendlin's (1996) processes of 'getting and resonating a handle' except that in this case, the resonating is happening in a more sociomaterially inclusive way.

4.3.3.1 Examples of 'testing' in architectural design practice

Example 19:

> [you have an idea and] *then you test it and you test it about performance, or technical things or whatever. But in each case there is not one solution, there are many ways you can do it, and it is the judgement that you bring to what materials you'll use, "what is the mood of the place?", "what is the quality of the light?" …and it is driven around interests.*

Example 20:

> *I can basically project a building in my imagination and walk through it and consider it working in different ways and qualities and spaces, so you kind of almost make like a movie of a building, then you can track through it. Then you begin to manifest that out. So, even though that image is ethereal, you can actually capture it when you start to design. You explore the design until you capture that sense of what it is that you are doing… I then work within a very rational process of spatial composition, geometry, structural rigor. You start to – I put kind of a system down, so everything is in a set geometric relationship. A relationship of materials, relationship of environments, so the imagination and the kind of the discipline or the kind of the physical or geometric kind of descriptions that go into interplay with each other, and then you begin to kind of – it's like a matrix, but it is held within an ordering system that you compose. And then once you begin to develop that then, you can situate yourself in the building that you're making and test it – test how it's working.*

Example 21:

> *…you've got a brief, and the brief spells out – in some respects – what you want to do. And that probably is a quantity, but it is a bit of about quality and a bit about quantity but it is at a very high level. As you gradually start to think about how the reality of the place starts to form, you are thinking about many dimensions and there are many ways that the brief could be met, and so you kind of develop a narrative effectively I guess, about why you are – for yourself and for others – as to why you are starting to think about it in a particular way and you speculate and then in speculating, you form propositions that start fairly loose and gradually become more detailed and more defined.*

'Testing' as it is seen in Examples 19, 20 and 21 refers to a foregrounding of the sociomaterial and technical aspects of design which must be considered if one is to make a design deliverable: "[you have an idea and] then you test it and you test it about performance, or technical things or whatever" (Example 19); "[After forming an 'image' internally], I then work within a very rational process of spatial composition, geometry, structural rigor" (Example 20); "you are thinking about many dimensions and there are many ways that that brief could be met, and so you kind of develop a narrative effectively I guess, about why you are – for yourself and for others" (Example 21). 'Testing' is about engaging with the necessary social and material aspects of context in order to refine a design and bring an 'image' to life on plan, and perhaps also in built product.

Example 19 is a description of design as a process which comes back to meeting various interests: "[you have an idea and] then you test it and you test it about performance, or technical things or whatever…and it is driven around interests". 'Testing' in this Example is a way to check the performance of a current 'image'. It is about proving whether (and in what ways) the current 'image' meets the needs of various stakeholders – developers, authorities, financier, builders, purchasers, for example. It is an iterative process of moving one's attention between the felt sense of what might suit, the 'image' as it is represented on plan and which is in some way informed by 'judgement', and the project requirements including 'materials', 'mood' and 'quality of light'.

Whilst this architect does not explicitly refer to the felt sense or the process of 'imagining', they do refer to 'judgement' which implies some kind of interiorly formed opinion.

> *Criticism is judgement. The material out of which judgement grows is the work, the object, but it is this object as it enters into the experience of the critic by interaction with how own sensitivity and his knowledge and funded store from past experiences. (*Dewey 2005, p. 322)

'Testing' is a way for this architect to check their 'judgement' (which informs an 'image') against the interests of key stakeholders, and the use of the reference 'judgement' (as in the process of forming an opinion) points to some kind of felt meaning and implies the presence of 'immersing' and 'imagining'. The architect refines the design by asking and 'listening' to themselves (the felt sense) and their knowledge of the interests of others (i.e. project context). Their 'judgement' is shaped at least in part by 'testing' against their perception of different interests. "But in each case there is not one solution, there are many ways you can do it, and it is the judgement that you bring to what materials you'll use, "what is the mood of the place?", "what is the quality of the light?"… and it is driven around interests". 'Testing', for this participant, is a process of checking the sociomaterial fit of their 'image' against the felt sense. It is an interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gesture of assessing fit (or misfit) of an 'image' against a more intricate appreciation of project context, including stakeholder interests.

Example 20 is an illustration of 'imagining' and 'testing' which uncovers some of the similarities and differences between them. "I can basically project a building in my imagination and walk through it and consider it working in different ways and qualities and spaces, so you kind of almost make like a movie of a building, then you can track through it. Then you begin to manifest that out" (Example 20). This is resonant of Pallasmaa's description of architectural imagining:

> *the act of imagining spaces and objects is not solely a visual endeavour; it is a process of embodiment and of feeling the entity as an imaginary extension of one's own body. Imagination is not a*

> *quasivisual projection, as we imagine through our entire embodied existence.* (2014, p. 82)

There is a kind of somatosensory quality inherent in the 'imagining' described in each of these accounts. This points to an experiencing of design thinking akin to 'getting and resonating a handle on' the felt sense. Once one has the felt sense of an 'image' and 'begins to manifest that out' (Example 20). "[E]ven though that image is ethereal, you can actually capture it when you start to design. You explore the design until you capture that sense of what it is that you are doing…" (Example 20). This description of the design process points to the gestures of 'imagining' and 'testing', where 'imagining' is more ethereal, experiential and interiorly-oriented and 'testing' is about capturing that 'image' in the process of representation. That is, the act of designing itself is a process of 'testing' and refinement.

> *I then work within a very rational process of spatial composition, geometry, structural rigor. You start to – I put kind of a system down, so everything is in a set geometric relationship. A relationship of materials, relationship of environments, so the imagination and the kind of the discipline or the kind of the physical or geometric kind of descriptions that go into interplay with each other, and then you begin to kind of – it's like a matrix, but it is held within an ordering system that you compose. And then once you begin to develop that then, you can situate yourself in the building that you're making and test it – test how it's working.* (Example 20)

This statement points to a kind of layering a system of constraints on top of an 'image' as a part of 'testing' its performance. There is a quasi-sequential character to this architect's process as they move from 'imagining' to 'testing' and back again. 'Testing' for them is about building a "relationship of materials, relationship of environments". The "ordering system" referred to offers a way to refine and clarify the design. It is a composite of technical requirements intended to support the design. It appears that through the gesture of 'testing' (a kind of layering in this case) an "ordering system" against an 'image', the 'image' and "ordering system" are somehow brought into relationship with each other. The design is 'captured' as an 'image' on plan through a process of exploring and integrating an interiorly-oriented sense of what might work

with sociomaterial aspects of project context (such as 'geometric relationship', and it is worth noting how this connects with Alexander's (1979) 'living pattern languages'). This architect refines their 'image' on plan by coming back to the 'image' of the design building in their imagination ('imagining') and experientially checking it for performance ('testing').

Example 21 is a description of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' – "…you've got a brief, and the brief spells out – in some respects – what you want to do" ('immersing'), "[a]s you gradually start to think about how the reality of the place starts to form, you are thinking about many dimensions and there are many ways that that brief could be met" ('imagining') and "so you kind of develop a narrative effectively I guess, about why you are – for yourself and for others – as to why you are starting to think about it in a particular way and you speculate… you form propositions that start fairly loose and gradually become more detailed and more defined" ('testing'). 'Testing' as it is described here relies on narrative to tell a story about why the design has taken shape in particular way. This is an example of 'testing' socially which allows the architect to check their ideas against the ideas of others. One can imagine that if such a narrative did not make sense it could be challenged and that a challenge would likely prompt a rethink and perhaps adjustment of the design. Working with others is an important part of design, and 'testing' socially is critical to design development. "In speculating, you form propositions that start fairly loose and gradually become more detailed and more defined" refers to 'testing' as a process of refinement. It characterises design as a process of incrementally stepping into the unknown, that is, 'speculating' and 'testing' one's sense of what might work against more and more of the project context (for example, stakeholder interests, technical requirements).

4.3.3.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'testing'**

The gesture of 'testing' is a process architects rely on in order to check whether a proposal fits the project context, including various stakeholder interests. It is about iteratively checking the fit (or misfit) of an 'image' with the felt sense and context. One

can only begin 'testing' if an 'image' has been formed. This implies prior gestures of 'immersing' and 'imagining'. 'Testing' is similar to 'immersing' in the way that it speaks to 'listening' and 'receiving' contextual data. In this case, however, the architect already has an 'image' of what might work and is, therefore, in a position to 'test' this design solution against various opportunities and constraints. Regardless of the outcome of 'testing' – whether aspects of the 'image' are validated or rejected – the design itself is carried forward. 'Testing' is resonant of and perhaps encompasses 'immersing' and 'imagining', and this implies a reliance on the finer resolution gestures of 'listening' and 'receiving' (and 'letting go' and 'connecting').

By referring to the relationship between an 'image', the felt sense and various aspects of context, one gets a sense of whether there is a fit, and thus, whether the design is fit for purpose. This is reminiscent of Gendlin's (1996) 'resonating a handle' but is not quite the same. With 'resonating a handle' Gendlin refers to the fit between the felt sense of an issue and the 'image, words or feeling' used to describe it. That is, 'resonating a handle' primarily takes place interiorly and results in some kind of symbolic representation. 'Testing' as it is laid out here refers to incrementally checking the fit of the felt sense against one's 'image' (either imagined or on plan) and various project requirements. It is a process of bringing in, or seeking out, more of the context in order to 'test' whether and in what ways the 'image' still fits. This is in some way implied in Gendlin's 'resonating a handle' but the iterative, sociomaterial and often drawn out character of creative work such as design is not something that is explicitly addressed. Where 'resonating a handle' is an interiorly-oriented process, 'testing' is an interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented process. It is in a way a process of refinement which relies on 'testing' by 'immersing' in context and a '(re)imagining' the 'image' in response to the evolving character of the felt sense. It is a process which results in validation or rejection of aspects of an 'image', and in either case carries the design forward. 'Testing' allows for the architect to see, in a more grounded way, whether and in what ways their 'image' – albeit still not yet fully developed – is still, given a new layer of understanding, fit for context.

4.3.4 THE GESTURE OF 'PERSEVERING' AND EXTENDING

Persevering
The gesture of 'persevering' refers to decision points of a kind of continuation. 'Persevering' is at play when one feels a point of integration between the felt sense and 'image', and as a result senses they are on a 'right' path and moves forward in a similar direction. It is a process step of persisting with and extending on an earlier step, as opposed to 'unwinding'. In some instances, 'persevering' could be considered an act of defiance in the face of opposition of some kind.

The gesture of 'persevering' is an experiential process of continuation. Each step which continues on in a similar direction from a prior step (a line on a page, for example) is a process of 'persevering'. Each step forward is a decision to persist with a direction. 'Persevering' relies on prior processes of 'immersing' and 'imagining', but is perhaps most tied to the process of 'testing'. One cannot know whether to persist unless one has undertaken some form of 'testing'. This implies a reliance on something like Gendlin's (1996) processes for 'connecting' to the felt sense – as in 'identifying and resonating a handle'. 'Persevering', however, unlike 'identifying and resonating a handle', is about bringing an 'image' to life on plan. It holds a quality of deliberateness – of leaning toward architectural detail and of bringing an 'image' on plan into the world. While 'connecting' with the felt sense relies on a kind of integration between the felt sense and a 'handle' (i.e. symbolic representation in the form of words, image or feelings), 'persevering' relies on a point of integration between the felt sense and one's 'image'.

'Persevering' is a process of continuation based on a point of integration while 'unwinding' (discussed next) is a process of unravelling and trying another way. There is an assertiveness and potential for defiance woven into 'persevering',[33] depending on the level of opposition and the extent of 'persevering' on either side of the relation.

[33] It is interesting to note that the implications of finding a kind of defiance or opposing force in the gesture of 'persevering' as illustrated here could speak broadly to the critiques of communicative planning theory (including Bäcklund and Mäntysalo 2010, Flyvbjerg 1998 and Hillier 2002, 2003) which often argue that its consensus-oriented (as opposed to conflict-oriented) tendencies ignore or exclude this possibility (that is, the likelihood and/or helpfulness of struggling against something). What is seen here, in the data, suggests that communicative processes of skilful practice include both consensus-building and agonistic characteristics.

Whilst constraints such as planning controls, project briefs, funding parameters, etc., are often a helpful part of design, there are times when such limits beg 'testing' and potentially pushing against or breaking through in some way. A constraint that is worth pushing against becomes known to architects when they attempt to find a point of integration between the felt sense and 'image' they are pursuing. If a point of integration does not appear possible, one asks the question 'what needs to change?'. If what needs to change means persisting with the current direction of an 'image', then 'persevering' is in order. If what needs to change means finding another way and unravelling the current design to some degree, then 'unwinding' is in order. In the case of 'persevering', the 'image' is carried forward toward another layer of detail, where with the gesture of 'unwinding' the design is unravelled to an extent and trying another way is necessary. Both 'persevering' and 'unwinding' are integral to architectural practice, and to decision-making in general. Here we discuss the gesture of 'persevering' with illustrations of how architects keep going on paths that feel to be 'right' or fitting in the face of opposition.

4.3.4.1 **Examples of 'persevering' in architectural design practice**

Example 22:

> *…sometimes it's your ability to, if I call it togetherness, not collaboration nor cooperation, because they kind of set up expectations, but togetherness means that people are thrown together in circumstances which they may not have been previously, working in that process that you can make things occur from the composition of people, so that's great. And other times, it's just pure desire to make a difference and change things with an idea or intention that you fundamentally believe in and that you drive into a circumstance, and push it through. And then, it is your kind of belief in that which will hold greater trajectory than people with lesser commitments. It can go either or it can be both. And obviously, you prefer the former rather than latter.*

Example 23:

> *I guess it's critical to be able to self-question and critique. And when I say 'self' I'm talking about the group of people working on the project. To allow yourself to be able to do that as objectively as possible without being tentative. So you have to be confident about the decisions you're making, but be able to self-*

> *question at various stages just to make sure that you're effectively self-testing. You've got to get testing the proposition back on yourself and on those around you… you're testing back against the brief and also if you've got a client in that instance, they're often a good sounding board for these things.*

Example 24:

> *Sometimes you make a judgement to go forward, persevere with something which you could be wrong or not quite right. Sometimes it's perfectly right and you were proven correct, and other times you can get it wrong.*

'Persevering' as illustrated in Examples 22, 23 and 24 is about 'making things occur from the composition of people' (Example 22), 'not being tentative' (Example 23) and 'making a judgement to go forward' (Example 24). It is a process of pushing forward and of 'making things happen' on a project despite various often competing and conflicting interests. 'Persevering' relies on one having a sense of which direction to go, it implies prior gestures of 'connecting' and 'testing' (amongst others).

> [At times] *you can make things occur from the composition of people, so that's great. And other times, it's just pure desire to make a difference and change things with an idea or intention that you fundamentally believe in and that you drive into a circumstance, and push it through. And then, it is your kind of belief in that which will hold greater trajectory than people with lesser commitments.* (Example 22)

This statement refers to two different kinds of 'persevering' during design – the first is a kind of spontaneous making through 'togetherness', and the second is a kind of forcing that is suggestive of defiance and/or aggressive determination. 'Persevering' in terms of the latter draws attention in a stronger manner to the need at times to "drive [an idea] into a circumstance, and push it through". For this architect, 'persevering' with some force is, at times, a necessary and appropriate means to see one's 'image' realised. "[I]t is your kind of belief in that which will hold greater trajectory than people with lesser commitments" (Example 22) implies resistance in some way to the ideas and 'images' of others – presumably both within one's team and outside of it.

This kind of ‘persevering’ is quite different from the friendly and welcoming ‘connecting’ with the felt sense described by Gendlin (1996). There is conflict and force of some kind associated with this which is quite likely somehow tied to power relations (even if only subconsciously). ‘Pushing’ and ‘driving’ imply that there is something to push up against, an opposition of some kind. It is an act of placing oneself and one’s integration of the felt sense and ‘image’ above that of another’s. ‘Persevering’ in instances like this is a matter of following what one believes to be the ‘right’ path by forcing to some degree the ‘unwinding’ of another party’s ‘right’ path and/or interests. It is interesting to note that ‘persevering’ in this sense would not really be possible without constraints or an oppositional force of some kind. ‘Persevering’ begins and ends when there is a conflict of some kind. Given the diversity of interests at stake in property development, it is not surprising that conflict and ‘persevering’ with one’s ‘image’ (which could also be considered a symbolic representation which needs to fit various interests) is an important part of practice.

In design “you have to be confident about the decisions you're making, but be able to self-question at various stages just to make sure that you're effectively self-testing. You've got to get testing the proposition back on yourself and on those around you” (Example 23). The process of ‘self-questioning, without being tentative’ implies ‘testing’ in a way that takes you closer to resolution. ‘Persevering’ in this case is about ‘testing’ one’s ideas as a way to strengthen the design and enables design development. “[T]esting the proposition back on yourself and on those around you” (Example 23) implies a process of foregrounding the ‘image’, the felt sense, and others involved in the design (which are considered here to be a part of the broader project context). It is this process of ‘testing’ that enables one to move forward in the current direction. Presumably, the reverse is also true, that is, that if one were faced with a lack of fit, the ‘image’ would be unravelled and adjusted to suit through a process of ‘unwinding’. The ‘self-questioning’ and ‘self-testing’ also imply ‘letting go’, ‘connecting’, ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’, and also ‘immersing’ and ‘imagining’. Gestures of carrying on through a process of ‘persevering’ (or to unravel by ‘unwinding’) rely on one coming to a sense of knowing. The forming of ‘propositions’ that one can ‘test’ implies reliance on a

combination of many of the gestures discussed previously. ‘Persevering’ is a most tightly linked, however, to the process of ‘testing’ which implies a way forward.

“Sometimes you make a judgement to go forward, persevere with something which you could be wrong or not quite right. Sometimes it's perfectly right and you were proven correct, and other times you can get it wrong” (Example 24). What is made clear by this statement is that ‘persevering’ does not negate the possibility of mistakes or of taking a ‘wrong’ path. It is a gesture to proceed in a particular direction based on judgement. Design of an ‘image’ – which in design thinking terms is described as ‘empathising, defining, ideating, prototyping and testing’ – relies on continually stepping into the unknown, despite not being certain of the merits of a particular direction. It may be, for example, that going down a particular path (‘persevering’) was necessary in order to understand that there is a better way (and subsequently ‘unwinding’, ‘immersing’, ‘imagining’, ‘testing’…). Therefore, ‘persevering’ is not necessarily about being ‘right’ but is more about a sense of ‘right’ at a particular moment that to prompts one to go in a particular direction. The felt sense is an emergent unclear bodily or somatic awareness situated in the now from which meaning emerges, that is, it is an experiential process of the creation of meaning (Gendlin 1997a). This implies that design and the formation of an ‘image’ is not predictable but rather emerges with each step. There is no completion but rather a pragmatic assessment of fit for purpose at a particular moment in time. There is no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ but rather an emerging sense of what fits. This comes internally at first, through leaning toward a point of integration between the felt sense and ‘image’. This ‘image’ is then brought to life with gestures of ‘persevering’ and ‘unwinding’ (and underlying gestures of ‘letting go’, ‘connecting’, ‘listening, ‘receiving, ‘immersing’, ‘imagining’ and ‘testing’).

4.3.4.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of ‘persevering’**

The gesture of ‘persevering’ refers to the process of following one’s sense of the ’right’ way forward (informed by a kind of fit between the felt sense, ‘image’ and project context). Typically, ‘persevering’ looks like a continuation of a particular direction. One

may be 'persevering' as a part of a collective, such as a project team, or as an individual. Either way one party's 'persevering' may result in another's 'unwinding'. It is a point of conflict at which time the one 'persevering' takes the lead (sometimes with force) and may as a result suppress another's will.

'Persevering' refers to decision points during design where the felt sense, 'image' and understanding of context point to a step toward architectural detail, as opposed to 'unwinding' away from architectural detail in preparation to take another path. Gestures of 'persevering' and 'unwinding' are where power relations come to the fore. 'Persevering' is a means to pursue one's interests in the face of opposition or constraints of some kind and is about pushing forward into the unknown. At this point one does not know whether such a move will take one closer to architectural detail, but has a 'sense' to take a step in 'this' ('persevering') direction. If the earlier finer resolution gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' are considered interiorly-oriented, the gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' (discussed next) may be considered interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented.

If one accepts that meaning and a sense of knowing are created communicatively, iteratively and interactively, as suggested in communicative planning theory, then 'persevering' is an illustration of how architects navigate opportunities and constraints. It is an example of how power is experienced and dispersed from a first person perspective. Such knowledge may enable progressive planners not just to provoke better design processes but to better anticipate and attend to "sources of misinformation threatening public serving, democratic planning processes" (Forester 1982, p. 67) in everyday planning situations. As Forester suggests:

> *Recognising structural, routine sources of misinformation, the progressive planner seeks to anticipate and counter the efforts of interests that threaten to make a mockery of a democratic planning process by misrepresenting cases, improperly invoking authority, making false promises or distracting attention from key issues.* (1989, pp. 46-47)

Urban planners working at the nexus between public sector planning, and private sector architectural design and property development must contend with, amongst other things, politics in the form of deliberate power playing and exclusion by the use of jargon, misrepresentation, deliberate withholding of information and deceit (Forester 1980, 280). Urban planners with an intricate understanding of the ways architects navigate opportunities and constraints (and move through processes of 'empathising, defining, ideating, prototyping and testing') to arrive at detailed architectural plans are well positioned to plan and regulate with prior knowledge of what will likely constrain and enable quality design practice to effect better integration of public and private interests.

4.3.5 THE GESTURE OF 'UNWINDING' AND STEPPING BACK TO MOVE FORWARD

Unwinding
The gesture of 'unwinding' refers to a decision to discontinue or reverse a design process. This is the gesture relied upon by architects 'letting go' of a particular direction and finding another way. A process of 'unwinding' does not necessarily mean that one made a mistake, but rather that one recognises that there is likely to be a better way. 'Unwinding' is a testament to architecture as an innovative and exploratory process. 'Unwinding' is the process of unravelling when one recognises that the 'image' is no longer a good fit with the felt sense and context. It explicates the movement of going back to an earlier point in the process of resolving a design, and then starting forward again from there. One would aim to go back as far as one needs to, to be at a place where the proto-design sits well. In some instances, 'unwinding' is considered an act of surrender in the face of opposition or obstruction of some kind but it is not always that. In other cases, 'unwinding' may come about from seeing another and more fitting way.

The gesture of 'unwinding' refers to a process of unravelling design to return to an earlier point in order to get closer to a point of integration between the felt sense and 'image'. One never returns to the same point because after 'unwinding' one is at an earlier point in the design process with a knowledge of a way forward from where one is. 'Unwinding' may take place in response to an interiorly-oriented sense of misfit, seeing another (and better) path or having another path imposed by others through their 'persevering' which may be in opposition to one's sense of fit, for example. 'Unwinding' is a process of being sensitive to lack of integration or is a surrender of sorts in the face of obstruction. Either way, 'unwinding' demands an ability to tap into an emerging sense of 'right' which to an extent undoes the state of the design. It implies

nonattachment to the form of an 'image' and follows a feel for what might suit as a symbolic representation of the architect's current felt sense.

'Unwinding' is about implicitly or explicitly returning to an earlier version or in a direction not anticipated in order to bring an 'image' toward resolution. It takes place in response to 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' one's 'image', and relies on 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving', and foregrounding one's interior sense of what might work. As one foregrounds more of the context (by 'immersing', for example), the felt sense shifts and one's sense of integration between the 'image' and the felt sense also shifts. 'Unwinding' is necessary when one recognises that the next 'right' step is to return to and move forward from an earlier version of the design. Despite its appearance as a backward move, 'unwinding' is a process of moving closer to resolution (even though resolution at one resolution may be 'letting go' at another – that is, of a project, for example). 'Unwinding' relies on prior gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' (and the finer resolution gestures these imply).

4.3.5.1 **Examples of 'unwinding' in architectural design practice**

Example 25:

> *…in those early stages, often there is an excitement that develops when you sort of – things are starting to emerge and ideas are there and schemes are put on the table and study models are there and all sorts of things. People get really engaged and excited and interested but on occasion* [we/they] *take a step back* [and], *go another way, because* [the design] *is not quite where it should have been and you need to not be precious when challenged by that. You need to see it* [designing], *as I said, a sort of flow, as a continuum.*

Example 26:

> *If you're spending too much time labouring over a solution it's likely that you're just going to be – it's unlikely that you're going to get that spark of inspiration if it's not flowing at all. For me you need to come back, and I think the thing I learned from* [being an architect] *that I find useful and maybe other designers* [do] *too, is that the process of overlaying a fresh piece of butter paper over some work you've done before and scribing something different on top of your previous idea is part of that process. So, you're kind of obscuring your last solution with a*

> *bit of butter paper and putting some fresh lines. And you're not just tracing the same thing again, you're actually creating something slightly different, at which time you're overlaying it with a piece of butter paper which architects love to do so much.*

Example 27:

> *you draw the idea and you keep going back to the drawing of the idea to make sure that you are not straying from that, but you are enriching it…getting to that idea is not just saying, "Oh, we're going to do it. We're going to do it like this. It's going to be a cube or something." My view is that you can't do that too early, you have got to absorb, explore, work with, engage, and gradually that – and sort of loosen its definition and gradually it becomes more defined. Sometimes you will throw random thoughts and test them and kind of* [go down] *that alley and stop and come back, and go down that alley. Or you will do something and you will engage with your client, and they will say, "No, no, no. Why are you doing that?" And then you unwind a bit, but it is kind* [of] *if you have to—it is not, "Oh throw that away. We'll go over there and do something over here." That is sort of unwinding a bit and going forward, testing and that is the sort of process that I am interested in. It is a process.*

'Unwinding' as it is illustrated in Examples 25, 26 and 27 is a process of taking a step back from a representation (or 'image') and trying another way. Each Example implies, if not explicates, a lack of fit between one's sense of the 'right' way and the 'image' on plan. Taking a step back in these instances refer to something like 'getting a handle' on the felt sense of what needs to change to take the design forward. 'Unwinding' is most clearly at play here when the architects notice a misfit between the felt sense of what suits the project context and the 'image' on plan, and respond by unravelling some part of the design. 'Unwinding' is also implied in a way during design development of all kinds whereby an 'image' is refined. One must step back from an 'image' to assess how and in what ways it needs to change in order to take it closer to resolution. Each new step is at one and the same time an 'unwinding' and a 'persevering'.

"People get really engaged and excited and interested but on occasions take a step back, go another way, because [the design] is not quite where it should have been and you need to not be precious when challenged by that. You need to see it, as I said, [design] is a sort of flow, as a continuum" (Example 25). This architect points to a kind of not

allowing oneself to be swept away by 'engagement' and 'excitement' but rather to stay faithful to the needs of the project. They refer to 'unwinding' in terms of unravelling a design because something about it does not fit. 'Unwinding' in this case is a sense of misfit – perhaps between 'the felts sense', project needs and the 'image'. The reference to "you need to not be precious when challenged by that" implies the need for a kind of nonattachment to a path taken if it does not meet project requirements. 'Unwinding' here is a way for the architect to heed when something is not working. 'Listening' and 'receiving', ('letting go' and 'connecting') and 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' are implied in this. They are the gestures which, each in a different way, take an architect to a point of 'unwinding' (or 'persevering'). The reference to design as a 'flow, or a continuum' is interesting because draws attention to the iterative and evolving character of design, as this architect anticipates moments of 'unwinding' and 'persevering' as part of the process. Perhaps seeing design in this way, as a continuum, is their way of 'letting go' and 'connecting', and staying faithful to subtle or gross shifts in the felt sense.

> *If you're spending too much time labouring over a solution it's likely that you're just going to be – it's unlikely that you're going to get that spark of inspiration if it's not flowing at all. For me you need to come back, and I think the thing I learned from* [being an architect] *that I find useful and maybe other designers too, is that the process of overlaying a fresh piece of butter paper over some work you've done before and scribing something different on top of your previous idea is part of that process. So, you're kind of obscuring your last solution with a bit of butter paper and putting some fresh lines. And you're not just tracing the same thing again, you're actually creating something slightly different, at which time you're overlaying it with a piece of butter paper which architects love to do so much.* (Example 26)

This description of the use of butter paper as a process of "kind of obscuring your last… and putting some fresh lines" (Example 26) is very resonant of 'unwinding' and 'persevering'. It appears that at the same time the architect is taking a step back ('unwinding'), they are also taking a step forward ('persevering'). The butter paper offers a way to circumvent the need to erase or retrace steps of an earlier idea by simply obscuring the last iteration of an 'image' and allowing 'fresh lines' to be drawn. This

Example also illustrates how 'unwinding' does not necessarily imply rewinding an 'image' on a plan but it does imply a kind of rewinding. The butter paper offers to obscure an existing 'image' in order to build upon it in a way that takes it closer to a point of integration with the felt sense. 'Unwinding' in this case is as much about 'persevering' and design development as it is about unravelling. Each of the gestures – 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving', 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' – are implied as one moves from one iteration of an 'image' on plan to the next.

> *… you draw the idea and you keep going back to the drawing of the idea to make sure that you are not straying from that, but you are enriching it…getting to that idea is not just saying, "Oh, we're going to do it. We're going to do it like this. It's going to be a cube or something." My view is that you can't do that too early, you have got to absorb, explore, work with, engage, and gradually that – and sort of loosen its definition and gradually it becomes more defined. Sometimes you will throw random thoughts and test them and kind of* [go down] *that alley and stop and come back, and go down that alley. Or you will do something and you will engage with your client, and they will say, "No, no, no. Why are you doing that?" And then you unwind a bit, but it is kind* [of] *if you have to—it is not, "Oh throw that away. We'll go over there and do something over here." That is sort of unwinding a bit and going forward, testing and that is the sort of process that I am interested in. It is a process.* (Example 27)

Example 27 is a rich description of many facets of the design process. It is a kind of meta reflection on design as a process of finding integration between one's image' and the felt sense. 'Unwinding' is implied throughout. "[Y]ou keep going back to the drawing of the idea to make sure that you are not straying from that, but you are enriching it" (Example 27) implies drawing as an iterative process of 'testing' an 'image' against one's sense of fit. Presumably if one had a sense of misfit, 'unwinding' would be necessary in order to carry the design forward. "[Y]ou have got to absorb, explore, work with, engage, and gradually that – and sort of loosen its definition and gradually it becomes more defined". 'Letting go' and 'unwinding' are implied in the process of gradually developing a design.

Perhaps the most clearly illustration of 'unwinding' is held in the second half of the statement "Sometimes you will throw random thoughts and test them and kind of [go down] that alley and stop and come back, and go down that alley…And then you unwind a bit, but it is kind [of] if you have to—it is not, "Oh throw that away. We'll go over there and do something over here." That is sort of unwinding a bit and going forward" (Example 27). Design is exploratory and iterative, and often involves 'testing' multiple scenarios for fit. 'Unwinding' in this case is about recognising when an 'image' does not fit and being ready to carry the design forward in another direction. According to this architect, 'unwinding' is not often a matter of throwing out a design, but rather of taking a few steps back and then moving forward again. This is a more detailed description of what takes place when one relies on the obscuring quality of butter paper described in Example 26.

4.3.5.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'unwinding'**

'Unwinding' is a critical part of design work. It is as critical as 'persevering'. Interestingly, 'unwinding' and 'persevering' can take place virtually simultaneously. As one progresses forward towards detail, at one resolution one is 'letting go' and 'unwinding' from an earlier 'image' albeit in a largely similar direction. It appears that the closer one looks at 'unwinding', one finds resonances with 'persevering', and perhaps vice versa. When considered as distinct, however, at times one must move forward along a particular path ('persevering'), and at other times one must take a few steps back and try another way ('unwinding'). The utility of differentiating is worth emphasising, alongside the fluidity one can observe in practice. Differentiating supports teaching and supports heightened forms of practice (the process of 'focusing' (Gendlin 2007) itself is an illustration). Practice can be complex in ways that are very diverse and so acknowledging both is appropriate. Both processes are integral to carry design toward resolution. 'Letting go' is more apparent in 'unwinding' than in 'persevering'. One must be willing to let go of attachments to a particular direction in order to unravel and take another path. The extent of change or disruption implied in 'unwinding' generally appears more severe than 'persevering'. Design is a process of iteration and 'testing', and therefore of

'persevering' and 'unwinding'. One cannot know whether an idea will work or not unless one takes that idea forward as part of an 'image'. Architects take many steps in resolving a design, they may make moves quickly or slowly that they later find feel like they fit or do not fit. 'Unwinding' is a process of responding to a sense of 'misfit' or misalignment between the felt sense, 'image' and the project needs.

4.4 PRESENTING A PARTIAL MODEL OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE

'Letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' were gestures typically used as a means to establish a connection with the felt sense. They are oriented towards how thinking happens and explain what goes on interiorly when one thinks to resolve an issue or situation. They are referred to here as a 'metaprocess of problem-solving'. The gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' point to aspects of design process whereby architects foreground either sourcing information ('immersing'), ideation and allowing an 'image' ('imagining') to form, or resonating an 'image' against project context and one's more holistic sense of what will fit ('testing'). This set of gestures are complementary and often accompanied by micro moments of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving'. They are oriented towards the making of a design (that is, what thinking leads one to do in a sociomaterial context). They are referred to here as part of a 'metaprocess of designing'. The gestures of 'persevering' and 'unwinding' point to a microprocess that is characteristic of design: virtually at all times, practitioners are either persisting with a direction ('persevering'), or unravelling and trying another path ('unwinding'), and at times they do both simultaneously ('persevering-unwinding'). They are important in explaining design *as* decision-making process. 'Persevering' and 'unwinding' may also be accompanied by the earlier gestures from a 'metaprocess of problem-solving' and a 'metaprocess of designing'. In general, it appears that the gestures underlying a 'metaprocess of problem-solving' are a micropractice embedded within the gestures underlying a 'metaprocess of designing' but this may not always be

the case. 'Listening', for example, could extend over long tracts of time perhaps beyond iterative reliance on 'immersing'.

There is a temporal and sequential logic in the gestures which assists in describing how architects do their work, but their temporality and sequence is always contingent and contextual rather than fixed and predetermined. It appears from the analysis that whilst the gestures can be described in a linear way, they are also at times evident as nested inside one another and taking place simultaneously. For example, 'receiving' implies 'listening' which implies 'connecting' which implies 'letting go'; 'testing' implies 'imagining' which implies 'immersing'. It is quite plausible that at times many of the gestures take place synchronously as well as chronologically, and this is especially evident with the latter gestures of each set which explicitly rely on previous gestures. There is also a quasi-spatial logic which assists in describing the resolution of each of these gestures and the way they take place in practice. For example, the interiorly-oriented gestures rely on one's attention being turned inwardly, and are most noticeable at the very fine resolution but can be seen as present over wider segments of time. The interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' point to microprocesses that emphasise the intrapersonal aspects of creativity rather than the sociomaterial. They are most noticeable at a slightly coarser resolution and across larger fragments of time. For example, 'immersing' predominantly takes place in the early stages of design, and involves building an understanding of project context in an attempt to provoke ideas placing the emphasis on the intrapersonal aspects of creativity rather than the sociomaterial.

Architects rely significantly on interiorly-oriented gestures of design such as 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving,' and interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' in their work. These gestures constitute a model of architectural practice which provides a way of understanding how architects go about design processes of empathising, defining, ideating, prototyping and testing. This is a partial model to show how architects bring an 'image' to life on plan. The finer resolution and interiorly-oriented gestures are a

means to finding a relationship with the felt sense. The slightly coarser resolution and interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' are present across larger tracts of time. 'Persevering' and 'unwinding' are processes which take place as a result of some kind of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing'. Both sets of interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures are a means to taking one's understanding of the felt sense (i.e. felt meaning) into the world by plan making. Architects rely on each of the gestures described (and, of course, many more) to carry their ideas from inkling to architectural detail. Knowing when and how to transition between gestures is critical to skilful architectural practice.

4.4.1 TRANSITIONING BETWEEN GESTURES IN PRACTICE

Understanding when and how practitioners' transition between the gestures described in this chapter in everyday practice is an important aspect of design work that needs further explication. What follows is a narrative showing how a few of the gestures discussed in this chapter come to life in practice. Each of these gestures can be seen in a quasi-sequential arrangement in concept design work and the generation of an architectural response – in this case, set in the context of masterplanning.

In the early stages of many urban regeneration projects in Australia expectations are formed by multiple parties involved in the creation, revision and/or the approval of a masterplan. A masterplan has to work from many perspectives to be viable. Understanding and attending to the interests of the affected public is a critical part of the development of such a plan. The masterplan process is highly political and typically includes politicians, public officers, architects, property developers, planners, engineers and other specialist consultants engaged to substantiate and/or assess a proposal and its anticipated social, environmental and/or economic impacts. Masterplans typically precede development applications on major urban projects and are conceptual in the sense that they often have a wider geographic scope and are less detailed than development applications. They are impactful in the way that they set the stage with what are intended to become regulatory boundaries and benchmarks in relation to which future (and substantially more detailed) design work put forward in development

applications and/or other planning authority approvals affecting the masterplanned site may be assessed. Masterplanning plays a critical role in the reframing of urban landscapes across public and private boundaries, often resulting in substantial changes (such as land use, zoning and envelopes) in an attempt to realise good (or better and more 'fitting') urban outcomes.

Gestures of designing such as 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' are very likely to be found in such situations where working groups made up of architects, planners, engineers, developers and other specialist consultants seek to identify solutions that meet the needs of various stakeholders with competing interests such as politicians, authorities, land owners, occupants, developers and the affected public. 'Immersing', for example, is necessary and evident in the collection and synthesis of relevant information such as a brief, plans showing land use, topography, utilities and services, and detailed as built drawings, any historic conceptual or masterplan work and regulatory controls for the site and its broader urban context. A detailed understanding of the site and its relationship with the broader urban landscape is critical in piecing together an urban story, and 'imagining' and expressing an architectural concept that might 'fit'.

'Imagining' in the case of a masterplan may be seen as a natural progression towards the creation of a new urban 'image' perhaps involving substantial changes in land use, height, footprint and envelopes. Done with sensitivity to the gesture of 'immersing', this new 'image' is informed by a detailed understanding of the brief, the site and the surrounding context which shapes the design process in ways that result in a concept that is 'fit' for context and purpose. For this architect, unsurprisingly perhaps, the project brief and site conditions are of critical importance to their creative own process:

> *I think that the inspiration is a client coming to you with a brief and then them saying we want a … whatever it is they want. It turns you on in terms of creative spirit because if you're really excited by the prospect of doing something new and you're excited by the opportunity of where it is, the siting of the situation and the brief, what its contents is in terms of its opportunities – social opportunities,*

> *environmental opportunities, or inventive opportunities that the particular brief gives you.* (Example 28)

As one comes up against site conditions and requirements of the project, referred to here as "the brief" and "the siting of the situation" (Example 28), one might ask whether it is worth considering the inclusion and purchase of an adjacent property for a strategic purpose such as accessibility and realigning the boundary to better suit the project vision. This Example involves 'immersing' oneself in the brief and site conditions and developing an understanding of opportunities and constraints associated with the project. 'Imagining' is, in this Example, a creative response to a set of conditions. It appears to be linked in a substantial way to the architect absorbing and coming to understand the project. This practitioner positions the role of the brief and one's own response to the brief as central to the creative process involving 'immersing' and 'imagining': "It [the brief] turns you on… you're really excited by the prospect of doing something new and you're excited by the opportunity …that particular brief gives you" (Example 28).

'Testing' is implied in Example 28 and likely to persist throughout the masterplan process as a result ideas coming from the gestures of 'immersing' and 'imagining'. One can anticipate that as the architect and design team develop the design, they will become more involved in the detail – both design detail, and specifics of the site and its surrounds. As one intentionally leans toward a new and generative 'image', one will need to be 'testing' these ideas to check that the direction of the design is one which adequately – but perhaps unequally and linked to power relations – represents the interests of various key stakeholders.

'Immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' are indeed critical to most design processes including masterplanning. Masterplans are designed to do away with the old by presenting something new. For that something new to make a valuable contribution, it should respond to the existing urban landscape while making way for an appropriate and forward thinking urban form of the future. To do that the design team must collectively – albeit at times in isolation – move or bounce between the gestures of

'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing'. The design process itself is about finding a solution to a problem:

> *So, I suppose all those creative juices come to a mix, a cocktail of ideas and things* [about] *how you're going to deal with it.* [Seeing the brief and the site] *starts a whole progress of thought reaction and it reacts between how you're dealing with a problem. I think architecture is not only an intuitive process there is an element of intuition in it, but it's also a rational process as well. You do have to mix the intuitive response with a rational response to it as well, so that's where the issues are.* (Example 29)

One can see in this Example an emphasis on the gesture of 'immersing' in the discussion of a "cocktail of ideas" in relation to "how you're going to deal with it" (Example 29). As the design begins to take shape in words, architectural drawings or copy, 'immersing' is evident in the reference "a cocktail of ideas and things" about 'how you are going to deal with a problem' (Example 29). 'Imagining' is pointed to in the reference to "creative juices" and the emphasis on "an element of intuition" (Example 29). 'Testing' is suggested by the comment that "the intuitive response" needs to be mixed with "a rational response"[34] (Example 29) – by which they mean such things as checking for fit with financial performance, engineering constraints and so on. 'Persevering' is kind of implicit in this quotation, there is a sense of forward movement which underpins the overall tone – that is a carrying forward of 'dealing with a problem' – but the microprocess itself as discussed earlier in this chapter is not obvious. Similarly, once can deduce that this process would involve 'unwinding' or some measure of it here – for example, one would expect to be faced with 'unwinding' with changes in the design

[34] 'Rational response' in this Example is taken to refer to the set of dynamic conditions which impact the design and delivery of the built form on the site. These are conditions which the design must respond to and includes physical considerations such as earth materials, solar, wind and acoustics; financial demands such as developer hurdle rates, construction budgets and equity requirements; and technical aspects of design such as area ratios, nuanced market expectations and dealing with complex structural solutions. In this case, 'testing' is a gesture which underpins how one might go about integrating the 'intuitive response' with a more 'rational response' (Example 29). The contrast made here between 'intuitive' and 'rational' is interesting and not one that sits well with Gendlin's (1996) definition of the felt sense. That is because the felt is in play in all thinking – that is, thinking is an embodied practice. As with body and mind (discussed in this thesis as body-mind), rational and intuitive is not an unusual contrast to make but one that I believe distorts the picture of what is going on.

coming from mixing of an "intuitive response" and a "rational response" – but it is not apparent in the same way as 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing'. These microprocesses are a way to understand the context, generate new ideas and check these new ideas against the site and brief including sociomaterial conditions such as land use, architectural form, topography, geotechnical composites and any relevant changes to those conditions that are anticipated to take place in the relevant future.

Now consider the example of whether to argue for inclusion of an adjacent site – owned by some other party – because of its potential to enhance public accessibility on a site. This would need 'testing' against a variety of competing interests. For example, the potential impact on time, cost and quality of the negotiations to purchase and include the site in the masterplan proposal are likely to hold valuable insights as to whether one (collectively) leans toward 'persevering' with the inclusion of the adjacent property or 'unwinding' from this idea and proceeding without the additional site. Of course, one might categorise this move interchangeably as 'persevering' or 'unwinding' depending on one's perspective and the scale at which one is looking at the process. As this architect puts it, in design work:

> *…you're testing it* [the design] *all the time. You have to test it. You have to test it against a rational process. I mean, it has to be tested against the environment, answering specific requirements of the brief, or it's answering problems in the social context or something comes in the political context and certainly in an economic context, so you answer those as well. So, there's many and there's technical and a whole heap of other things that you do test on. They can be almost in your own mind, you can be doing them through intuitive process, it can almost be instantaneous, you know click, click, click, click, you think superficially it's answering all those things, and then you go back and you do a further probe to various degrees and stages of investigation and your original assumption is my… or it should be reasoning right because of experience of it. Sometimes in further investigation, they* [the earlier assumptions] *could be wrong and/or unproven or not being able to be substantiated in the line of what you're doing, but it is a definite process.* (Example 30)

The foregrounding of 'testing' in this Example – "You're testing it [the design] all the time against a rational process" – draws attention again to the need for design work to

be response to the material conditions within which it is situated. The gesture of 'testing' is brought to the fore with phrases such as 'there are a whole heap of things that you do test on' and presumably as one finds solutions to design issues one sense a clicking into place: "click, click, click, click" (Example 30). But this may only be a 'superficial answer' which demands further 'testing'. As the design progresses into detail, "you do a further probe to various degrees" (Example 30).

The gesture of 'unwinding' is also highlighted in this Example with reference to: "Sometimes in further investigation, they [the earlier assumptions] could be wrong and/or unproven or not being able to be substantiated in the line of what you're doing, but it is a definite process" (Example 30). 'Unwinding' here has is to do with how one might need to unravel some design work in response to more concrete conflicting information. For example, very early on in the design process, architects need to make assumptions about solar, wind and acoustic conditions to do concept work. These assumptions and the proposed concept design, particularly relating to the façade, may be challenged and undermined as specialist reports are received, or planning regulations and site conditions change, for example. Feeling into one's relationship with a situation, and particularly in this case that need to be made, is a subtle but critical process of developing and refining a design. One's felt sense of a given situation, in this Example whether an aspect of the design 'clicks' or not, is important because it enables the design to be carried forward – for example, by 'persevering' when it 'clicks' and 'unwinding' when it does not.

4.4.2 GESTURES AND METAPROCESSES OF DESIGNING

> *There is always a gap between the here and now of direct interaction and the past interactions whose funded* [or embedded] *result constitutes the meanings with which we grasp and understand what is now occurring. Because of this gap, all conscious perception involves a risk; it is a venture into the unknown for as it assimilates the present to the past it also brings about some reconstruction of that past.* (Dewey 2005, p. 284)

The gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' describe, in somewhat simplified terms, a process that is the backbone of designing: getting to know a situation, coming

up with designs (and elements of designs), and testing them against the details of the situation to trigger further improvements. As one proceeds with this iterative process, two practices – whose joint importance might seem paradoxical – play key organising roles. One needs 'persevering' to keep developing and 'testing' to explore the promise of a line of design thinking. Yet at the same time it is crucial that one has an openness to stepping back ('unwinding') and restarting design thinking from an earlier point that now feels more solid. Integrating these two movements in a way that carries the overall design process forward is fundamental to effective designing. Supporting these coarser resolution gestures are four finer resolution gestures that function together as a process for developing fresh insights or problem-solving. These are 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving – called here a 'metaprocess of problem-solving'. These four gestures, separately and together, play important supporting and enabling roles in each of the five coarser resolution practices delineated here: 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing', and 'persevering' and 'unwinding'. When one looks at all these gestures together, one finds one has described characteristics of designing, characteristics that work together *as* a model of designing. TABLE 4.3 summarises the contribution of this chapter.

TABLE 4.3: SUMMARY OF A PARTIAL MODEL OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE

Metaprocesses	**Gestures**	**Contribution**
Metaprocess of problem-solving	'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving'	Reveals aspects of how thinking happens to resolve issues
Metaprocess of designing	'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing'	Reveals aspects of how thinking leads to doing, and how doing happens
	'persevering' and 'unwinding'	Reveals design *as* a decision-making process

At this point, it is worth reiterating the core characteristics of the phenomena which underpins each of these metaprocesses and gestures:

i) The felt sense and its eight primary characteristics (Gendlin 1996, pp. 16-24): 'forms at the border zone between conscious and unconscious; has at first only an unclear quality (although unique and unmistakable); is experienced bodily; is experienced as a whole, a single datum that is internally complex; moves through steps; it shifts and opens step by step; a step brings one closer to being that self which is not any content; the process step has its own growth direction; and theoretical explanations of step can be devised only retrospectively'; and

ii) An 'image': is a symbolic representation of the felt sense at a particular moment in time (Gendlin 1996, 1997a). It may come at first as words, images, sounds, feelings etc. but in architectural practice is predominantly transformed into lines on a page as a representation or projection of a future built form. An 'image' comes from a direct reference to the felt sense in relationship with one's knowledge of the project context.

Whilst understanding project context and developing an 'image' (or plan) for a site are commonly discussed, particularly in architectural circles, the notion that skilful design relies in some way on being sensitive interiorly-and-sociomaterially is not so widely discussed (except for authors such as Alexander 1979; Franck and Lepori 2007; Pallasmaa 2009, 2013, 2014). It appears that there is much more to architectural practice than is well or easily articulated and that the process of allowing the felt sense of a situation – that is, the felt sense in relationship with the project context and an 'image' – to inform decisions is an example of that, as are the underlying gestures.

Bringing this more interiorly- (and-sociomaterially) oriented view of architectural practice to the fore highlights the uncertainty that architects face. The sense of knowing that architects rely on comes incrementally with every step. Skilful design is a practice of continually stepping into the unknown. Experienced architects appear to form a sense of knowing interiorly (albeit fallible) and allow, this to quite a large extent to inform their practice. This experiential process of knowing is very resonant of Gendlin's (1996) discovery of the felt sense. In architectural practice, one listens interiorly to an emergent

sense of where to go next. This sense is then tested against the 'image' and project context, and refined where considered appropriate. One cannot know in advance whether a particular line on a page will stand the test of time and in fact this does not really matter. What is perhaps also important to recognise is that one's sense of how to move forward changes with every moment, and that these incremental shifts in knowing are what carries design forward. It is iterative moments of integration or a sense of fit with the 'image' that tell an architect that something about the design is 'right'.

Architects rely on the gestures and metaprocesses in order to come to these moments of integration – akin to a sense of knowing or clarity. Design thinking processes of 'empathise, define, ideate, prototype and test' (Institute of Design at Stanford 2017) are underpinned by such gestures. Throughout the design process, designer's attempt to find a sense of fit with the evolving 'image' and extend this sense of fit to the next step towards resolution. The next step is always into the unknown and one's sense of fit or felt sense changes with each moment. Thus, design as a process of creating is about uncertainty, incompletion and travelling into the unknown. It is a pulsation of fit and misfit, of 'persevering' and 'unwinding' (and the gestures that underpin these processes), as one leans towards resolution, and ultimately arrives at a sense of fit for purpose, although not a sense of completion *per se*, as there is always more to come.

Architects create meaning and a sense of orderliness through evolution of the felt sense in relation with the evolution of an 'image' which results in an architectural plan. Design practice can, therefore, be characterised as complex and an experiential process of iteratively dealing with uncertainty. Much architectural skill relies on allowing a sense of knowing to form interiorly, and in heeding such a sense in the creation and carrying forward of an 'image'. Such skill is represented in the processes of problem-solving and metaprocess of designing explored in this chapter.

5: GESTURES AND METAPROCESSES EMERGING FROM PRIVATE DEVELOPER PRACTICE:

5.1 WHY PRIVATE DEVELOPER PRACTICE MATTERS

> *The developer, as the leading economic actor in this market, takes on the important economic function of resource allocation, to create new space and investment interests in property. The developer is the agent who, operating within an imperfect price mechanism, carries heavy responsibility for the optimal use of scarce land resources th*[r]*ough development activity. In this respect the developer's role is essentially one of supplying a stream of entrepreneurial services to the property market through both the identification and activation of market opportunities.* (D'Arcy and Keogh in Guy and Henneberry (eds) 2002, p. 19)

Private developers are lead brokers and negotiators of the resources required to deliver built product (D'Arcy and Keogh 2002). Property developers are key stakeholders in the delivery of public sector urban planning and architectural design aspirations. Their primary role is to oversee (and bear much of the risk associated with) private sector transformation of public sector urban plans and policies into project proposals and built product. Urban plans and policies, and associated planning practice guide the design and delivery of appropriate quality development processes determined by governments and that result in built form. Implementation of those plans, however, requires that their "various principles and norms [are] taken up and used in the multiple interactions that [take] place in the ongoing flow of project development and implementation" (Healey 2003, p. 103).

Implementation of planning aspirations and delivery of urban form is a process of negotiation (Forester 1989; Campbell 1996; Healey 1997). Public sector urban planners need to understand private sector developer practice, including the way key private sector stakeholders navigate opportunities and constraints shaped by planning practice,

to create ways to anticipate, facilitate and, if necessary, counteract developer practice to realise planning aspirations in built product (Forester 1989).

> *Urban development is a complex process which entails the orchestration of finance, materials, labour and expertise by many actors within a wider, social, economic and political environment. The physical building is the tip of the iceberg with much that is hidden beneath the surface.* (Guy and Henneberry 2002, p. 5)

Simply put, private developers pursue timely integration of planning controls, architectural designs, development sites and property markets first in plan, and then in built product. They oversee private design and delivery processes (including architectural practice) with a view to realising built product that is fit for purpose and commercially viable. They strive to meet the demands of those participating in property markets while working within social, political, economic and environmental opportunities and constraints set by planning authorities and the biophysical conditions of sites.

In this chapter, private property development is framed by two main processes – design and delivery. Design is primarily an architectural practice of design documentation (as discussed in Chapter 4) and delivery is primarily a private developer practice of negotiating the necessary flow of resources to enable realisation. In private property development, both design and delivery are typically directed by developers. Viewed in this way, private developer practice includes and extends beyond managing and financing architectural practice toward delivery. Private developers are responsible for the organisation and integration of the work of public planners, architects and other specialist consultants, and the resources needed to achieve timely and profitable realisation.

Despite diverse, and sometimes divergent, interests and aspirations, there is common ground between public sector urban planners and private sector developers. Both seek quality urban form albeit through different means and often with different ends in mind.

As discussed in Chapter 1, public planners typically aspire to effect urban outcomes in public and private interest terms, while private developers typically strive to meet the needs of property markets and private interests. Both work to meet the interests of various and often diverse sets of stakeholders in urban development in an attempt to realise built form, and both rely on processes of designing and negotiating. Public urban planners design plans and frame policies which shape urban form, and negotiate urban outcomes via assessment processes which ultimately either approve (with conditions) or reject the delivery of built product. Private developers oversee and often involve themselves in various aspects of architectural design, and negotiate the allocation of resources necessary to enable construction. The significant overlap and resonance between public sector urban planning and private sector development presents an opportunity for public planners to gain insight from private developer practice.

> *Communicative planning focuses on the role of the planner as mediator among diverse interests (Fainstein, 2000). It draws on theories of rhetoric, argumentation, communication, negotiation and bargaining to show how planners might exploit their position by influencing the definition of problems, the management of information flows, the inclusion or exclusion of stakeholders, the form of the bargaining and negotiation processes and so on (see, for example, Forester, 1989; Healey, 2006). However, communicative planning is criticised for taking an 'insider's' view (Richardson, 1996). It fails sufficiently to acknowledge planners' position within a nexus of power and the implicit acceptance of the validity of expert knowledge, logic and action that results (McGuirk, 2001). This diverts attention from the powerful 'material and political processes that shape cities and regions' (Yiftachel and Huxley, 2000, 907). Communicative planning's emphasis on (fair) procedure is at the expense of a consideration of planning's contexts and outcomes. (Fainstein, 2000; Campbell, 2006)* (Hennberry and Parris 2013, p.228)

Attending to developer practice at a fine resolution is one way to broaden the scope and influence of a communicative planning perspective which typically focuses on improving public practice outcomes by focusing on the finer grained aspects of public planning practice (Forester 1989; Healey 1997; Innes 1995). Public sector urban planning and instantiation of planning aspirations in built product is about much more than just

planning practice. Others such as architectural and private developer practice need to be researched alongside public planning practice in order to understand land and property development (Imrie and Thomas 1993). Private developers exert a powerful influence over the social, political and material organisation of development processes and the ensuing built product.

> *The communicative character of planning practice involves much more than how clearly planners write or speak. What planners choose to say – and choose not to say – is politically crucial. If planners take the role of "informed technocrats", for example, they can focus attention on technical issues but obscure important political relationships. Or if planners present themselves as neutral mediators, they can encourage premature consensus-building when empowerment and organising strategies, pre-negotiation strategies are more appropriate. If planners adopt roles that ignore the political world, they will seriously misrepresent public problems and opportunities.* (Forester 1989, p. 153)

A fine grained model of developer practice as pursued in this chapter, offers complex understandings of how development processes are organised socially, politically and materially. Looking carefully at private developer practice at a fine resolution offers a window into how developers affect the integration of public urban plans, policies and practice, architectural detail and built form. It poses opportunities for public planners and developers to create, design and negotiate in clearer alignment and to potentially improve the quality of urban outcomes in both public and private interest terms. There are cues in the interview data analysed here in the ways developers approach risk and work within market constraints. Property developers must find ways to obtain authority approvals, project finance, market, sell or lease, and deliver built product. They broker the design and delivery of built form, taking the development risk for a potential return.

Looking closely at private property developer practice offers a way to uncover intricacies associated with developer practice and, in simple terms, the evolution of an 'image' (i.e. detailed architectural design) in response to the unique and dynamic characteristics of development sites, planning controls and property markets. It is a way to understand

how property developers and others working under their direction, such as architects, navigate opportunities and constraints in the pursuit of saleable built product. This kind of knowledge is potentially advantageous to public planners who want to improve the quality of negotiations with private developers. It may contribute to enabling them to put themselves in the shoes of private developers and to speak to their interests as well as the public interest. Planning in this way, as a progressive communicative planner, is about being sensitive to the needs, interests and inclinations of key stakeholders with whom one is interacting and dependent upon.

> *If they anticipate the interests and commitments of affected groups, planners can build political support in addition to producing technically sound documents. Technical analysis cannot stand alone. Vivid studies show that the "technician" role of planning analysis is often frustrating and ineffectual if divorced from the pragmatic considerations of political communication: maintaining trust and "an ear", lobbying, addressing the specific concerns of decision-making audiences as well as the intrinsic merits of the project themselves, and so on.* (Forester 1989, p. 156)

Property developers (like everyone) are both rational and irrational; they are entrepreneurial players committed to meeting the needs of those participating in property markets (Adams and Tiesdell 2010). Entrepreneurship and risk-taking in which the felt sense (Gendlin 1996, 1997a) plays a critical role is quite apparent in the data. These instances of developer practice point to a resonance with architectural design in terms of reliance on the felt sense. Both architectural design and development processes are characterised by travelling into the unknown, and developers (and architects) ultimately aspire to find a point of integration between the felt sense and 'image'. 'Image' for developers encompasses more than architectural detail and includes aspects of development which make delivery possible, such as resource allocation. While architectural practice predominantly involves presenting an 'image' in plan form (i.e. design), property developer practice predominantly involves bringing together the resources necessary to deliver such a plan in concrete form (i.e. negotiation). The risk and potential returns involved in property development compared with architectural practice is typically much greater.

Urban form will always differ in some way from individual architectural and developer aspirations because architects and developers work sociomaterially. They rely on the work of many others in order to deliver in their own practice, and so have only partial control over practice outcomes. As was illustrated in Chapter 4, architects are with each step, and to varying degrees depending on the level of creativity and risk involved, travelling into the unknown and responding to changes in context. Understanding the interactive and interdependent qualities of how developer and architectural practice is organised socially, politically and materially is critical to public planners who seek better integration between urban planning aspirations and private interests through creative intervention.

In this chapter, analysis uncovers intricacies and complexities of developer practice at a fine resolution by building on the approach to architectural design practice discussed in Chapter 4. Here, the two sets of gestures discussed in Chapter 4 – interiorly-oriented gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' (also referred to as a 'metaprocess of problem-solving'), and interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' (also referred to as a 'metaprocess of designing') – are illustrated in private developer practice. In developer practice, the 'metaprocess of designing' is not so much about laying out architectural detail in plan form, but rather a means to enabling the developer to know what it is they intend to deliver in built form.

Three new gestures are then introduced – 'committing', 'brokering' and 'togethering' – which are also characterised as interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented but are considered a separate 'metaprocess of negotiating'. These additional gestures speak more to the ways developers work together and find agreement with others in successfully brokering the flow of resources. The metaprocesses and gestures discussed in this chapter make the following contribution in relation to private developer practice:

i) mapping interiorly-oriented gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' (oriented towards how thinking happens, referred to as a 'metaprocess of problem-solving', previously explored by Gendlin (1997a) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) and mapped to architectural design practice in Chapter 4);

ii) mapping interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing' (oriented towards how thinking informs making, referred to as part of a 'metaprocess of designing' and mapped to architectural design practice in Chapter 4);

iii) mapping interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'persevering' and 'unwinding' (looking at delivery process as decision-making process, referred to as part of a 'metaprocess of designing' and mapped to architectural design practice in Chapter 4); and

iv) identifying and mapping interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures 'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' (looking at delivery process *as* brokering and referred to as a 'metaprocess of negotiating').

As was the case in Chapter 4, there is a temporal and sequential logic in the gestures which assists in describing how developers do their work, but this is contingent and contextual rather than predetermined. The boundaries between the gestures are loosely cast and 'fuzzy', and the gestures themselves often present as nested and/or taking place at the same time. What is offered in this chapter is a model of skilful developer practices which builds on the model of skilful architectural practices described in Chapter 4 broadly by 'testing' whether the same gestures apply to skilful developer practice, and 'listening' to what kinds of additional gestures are worth describing. Similarly to the model of architectural practice presented in Chapter 4, what is presented here is not an exhaustive account of developer practice but rather a model of critical skills that influence developer creativity and contribute to the shape and quality of urban form.

The additional gestures of 'committing', 'brokering' and 'togethering' foreground private developer practice as negotiation. This chapter builds on the models of architectural practice developed in Chapter 4 by comparing the gestures and metaprocesses with the raw developer data and makes a new contribution with the 'metaprocess of negotiating'. In doing so, this chapter illuminates resonances and potential dissonances between architectural and developer practice. What is termed a 'metaprocess of designing' in Chapter 4, is evident in developer practice less as a means to architectural plan making (or designing), and more broadly as a means to brokering the flow of resources to enable delivery. Unexpected resonances between architectural and developer practice emerged from the analysis, which raises some interesting questions as to what this might mean for urban planning practice, particularly in terms of how skilful practice might be transferred across disciplines.

5.2 GESTURES OF PROBLEM-SOLVING IN DEVELOPER PRACTICE

Private developers, like architects, depend profoundly on skills in problem-solving. Looking closely at the practice of skilled property developers reveals a dependence on a set of gestures for generative thinking, evident in architectural practice, that Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) (and some others, see Walkerden 2009) discovered independently. The following section is a review of the interiorly-oriented gestures that underpin skilful developer practice. This is followed by mapping of interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures which take place at a slightly coarser resolution.

5.2.1 THE GESTURE OF 'LETTING GO' AND OPENING

Letting go
'Letting go' is a gesture of slowing down and releasing bodily tensions that may prevent one from finding a connection with oneself. It offers a way to open up to future possibilities – to the new and the fresh. It may be relied on in two main ways: as a general act of 'letting go' to 'create a space' for fresh thinking without a particular focus in mind, or as a way to make space for fresh thoughts with a particular issue in mind. In both cases, 'letting go' offers to release distractions and instate a curiosity for what may come.

Note: Adapted from Table 10.1 'Two schemas for listening to ourselves' in Walkerden (2005, p. 182) and replicated in TABLE 4.1 (p. 117).

Property developers rely on being open to market opportunities in order to be in and remain ahead of the game, and profitable. 'Letting go' is a process of 'clearing a space' (Gendlin 1996) and opening oneself up to the unknown and the new. This gesture is critical for developers as they seek to intuit development opportunities. It is a way to open up to the new and the fresh and a sense of what might be possible and profitable. Each of the Examples that follow illustrate, in different ways, 'letting go' as a process which enables one to carry on the practice of development.

5.2.1.1 Examples of 'letting go' in property developer practice

Example 31:

> *… in all my 52 years we only had about three projects which didn't come up to expectations and we lost money. Mind you, there are quite a few that didn't come up to the expected return, but they still showed a profit – only three where we actually lost money. But the attitude for this business must be, do your absolute best, continue to have a degree of considered careful appetite for risk, otherwise you can't be in this business. And then when the results are not as you expected, it is just another result, move on, mate. Just move on.*

Example 32:

> *How* [does a way forward] *come about? It just comes about through doors opening and investigating different alternatives, and I think when you start down a journey, you always start in a period of uncertainty and you could say for every step you take, you get a little bit more certainty both in the positive and negative… it is that balance – the yin and yang or whatever you want to call it – but it is that give and take. It is just taking baby steps and going on a journey and being prepared to go on a journey, potentially nowhere.*

Example 33:

> *So and it just unfolds through… sometimes just through time. Time sometimes is a great – time is often a great solution finder. And I think what happens is that if you invest your time and your mind – and you could say your heart as well – into what you are doing, the body has a unique – you know the body and mind – have a unique way of finding a solution. And it just evolves.*

The developer in Example 31 relies on the gesture of 'letting go' as a way to manage uncertainty and risk which are characteristic of development. 'Letting go' for them is somehow tied to having a 'considered and careful appetite for risk'. It appears that despite not meeting expectations at times, the attitude must always be to continue, and to lean toward the unknown as the process of property development demands. 'Letting go' here names taking a relaxed relation to what is occurring – relaxed in places where one might not expect that. The leaning toward the unknown is a gesture of embracing, acting or aspiring while not knowing, which is distinct from 'letting go'. 'When the results are not as you expected you must just move on'. 'Letting go' here is both a way to continue and to deal with unexpected and perhaps destabilising losses with an attitude of acceptance.

Of course, 'letting go' and moving on to the next project may not always be as easy as one might like, such as in the case of insolvency, but it is often still possible to enter the game again at some point in the future. Such has been the case with a number of, at times very successful, developers over the years who have become stronger and more determined having faced an unexpected or poorly timed property downturn and/or bankruptcy. 'Letting go' in this Example is about 'clearing a space' (Gendlin 1996) for the next venture despite what may be less than ideal circumstances. One must at times 'just move on' and turn toward the next project if one is to continue in such an industry. Overall, 'letting go' here is very resonant of Gendlin's (1996, p. 71) characterisation of 'clearing a space' for the new by being welcoming and friendly to oneself inside and coming to terms with what stands between one's current state and feeling fine.

Example 32 is an illustration of how one finds a way forward at the very early stages of a project. This developer 'investigates different alternatives' and waits for 'doors to open' – it is not clear here which comes first. 'Letting go' is implied in the characterisation of the development process as 'starting a journey in a period of uncertainty'. There is a 'letting go' of needing to know, of being clear about where one will get to, evident here. 'Letting go' enables one to 'take baby steps' (i.e. participate). In a way, one must be comfortable with the possibility of either success or failure. This developer expects a new project to bring much uncertainty and for this in some way to diminish over time. Perhaps this is because with every forward step, one moves closer to delivery and, therefore, the risk of non-performance is reduced. The beginning of a project which is led by intuitions about potential rather than design documentation and legally binding agreements carries more risk and perhaps, therefore, demands that more attention be paid to each step. "For every step you take, you get a little bit more certainty" (Example 32).

The notion that one must be 'prepared to go on a journey potentially nowhere' is interesting because it implies that developers, like architects, feel their way through uncertain terrain until things either come to something or not. There is a sense of 'letting go' at the same time as 'taking baby steps' (i.e. participating) but one must in a way be comfortable with the possibility of either scenario – of success or failure. As with Example 31, this developer demonstrates knowledge and acceptance of this. One could conclude here quite comfortably that opportunity is far more prevalent in the early stages of a project. One is honing an outcome to a degree with every step. It is therefore at the early stages where one is more tentative and exploratory in approach that one 'takes baby steps' and that 'letting go' is perhaps most clearly at play. The 'give and take' here may refer to taking a step, looking at the result and reorienting for the next step, and/or perhaps it refers to gestures of 'persevering' and 'unwinding', of persisting at times and of taking a step back in the sense of unwinding at other times. Either way, the lack of a sense of control permeates this developer's process.

'Letting go' as it is described in Example 33 implies a kind of absence of performance. On occasion, this developer allows time (and nothing else) to find a solution. Being at ease with uncertainty is implied in this developer's practice and refers to an openness and a 'letting go' of control. *"Just unfolds"* and *"just evolves"* point to not being in any simple sense in control. "Time is often a great solution finder" points to a sense that appreciating one is not in control of the process is fundamental. "The body [... has] a unique way of finding a solution" also points to letting things come, from the perspective of the aware, thoughtful practitioner. There appears to be an attitude of leaning toward a solution (seen in "you invest your time and your mind" (Example 33)), but no specific action is taken beyond what could be seen as the gesture of 'letting go'. This developer also demonstrates a faith in the body that is not often openly discussed in business circles such as these. In their view, 'the body has a unique way of finding a solution' (Example 33). This appears very resonant of Gendlin's description of the felt sense as having its own growth direction: "It is development when something stirs inside that has long been immobile and silent… and when life's energy flows in a new way" (1996, p. 21).

There is an openness and vulnerability tied up with this developer's approach to problem-solving. They hand over the reins so to speak to the body-mind in order to find a solution. The finding is actually in being attentive and receptive, as compared with a more active or imposing attitude.

5.2.1.2 Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'letting go'

For property developers a 'letting go' of control – and allowing – can be fundamental to how they go about 'persevering'. It is as though the 'letting go' aspect of their 'persevering' supports being in an improvisational, open relation to the situation, which in the early stage, in particular, is still adaptive. For property developers, the gesture of 'letting go' is in some ways resonant of 'persevering'. It offers a way to continue as a developer in the face of the unknown and uncertainty about what will unfold, including financial outcomes that are less than pleasing. It enables developers to carry on with

their work despite being embedded in risk and uncertainty. In fact, 'letting go' and clearing a space inside appears in some instances to be crucial to problem-solving. 'Letting go' in these Examples implies a kind of openness, vulnerability and acceptance of the unknown.

There is an overall sense of letting the body-mind inform the next step as part of a continuum of practice and of moving forward. These developers appear to have accepted a degree of not knowing as 'par for the course' and in doing so, have integrated 'letting go' into their practice. They each demonstrate openness to what may come at the same time as being a part of (and perhaps also at the mercy of other aspects of) the process. There is a sense of allowing what may come (including unintended outcomes) at the same time as taking action in the direction of where they would like their process to be headed. There are times when 'letting go' is about being friendly with oneself and moving on from mistakes, and other times when it is about being friendly with oneself and allowing 'the body' to find a solution to a particular problem. Either way, there is a persistent leaning toward the new and fresh.

5.2.2 THE GESTURE OF 'CONNECTING' AND ESTABLISHING RELATIONSHIP

Connecting 'Connecting' refers to the gesture of finding a symbol to represent an aspect of experiencing. One 'gets a handle' and 'resonates the handle' (which may be in the form of images, words and/or feelings) until one arrives at a sense of 'fit' between the aspect of experiencing one is attending to (in the form of a felt sense) and the symbol/s employed to represent that particular aspect of experiencing.

Note: Adapted from Table 10.1 'Two schemas for listening to ourselves' in Walkerden (2005, p. 182) and replicated in TABLE 4.1 (p. 117).

Property developers rely on 'connecting' as a way to make their way through the uncertainty and risk characteristics of development processes. 'Letting go' is about opening oneself up to new possibilities, 'connecting' is a step toward coming to terms with what this new information means. 'Connecting' implies one has gone through a process of 'letting go' and will go through processes of 'listening' and 'receiving'. These four gestures hang together to show how insight happens. Skilful architects and

developers tend to rely on 'connecting' as a means to understand and express (through symbolic representation) the relationship between themselves and the object of their attention.

5.2.2.1 Examples of 'connecting' in property developer practice

Example 34:

> *Within myself there's a – when that actually happens, there's an unease. So it just doesn't sit well with me,* [I am] *not comfortable having digested that the issue or considered that the issue at hand well enough at the time.* [I] *probably need a clear head space. So I just feel unresolved in that particular moment…* [Time] *allows me to access a whole bunch of options that just come to mind. At different points in time, doing different things, right, but they're completely unrelated to thinking about the issue at hand. And the mind starts going off in different directions at different points of time, and it's like slots in a... merry-go-around – got different quarters on a merry-go-round and so it's just sort of like stopping at different points and saying, "Is that floor right? No, next and no, next." Until I find the right combination*….[When I find the right combination] *Then I feel calm.*

Example 35:

> *How do I know? I just know Kate is that good enough?* [laughter] *I just know. How do I know? I mean it is the old gut instinct, isn't it? It is a feeling. You can almost say that it is when your mind and your gut come together, and actually meet… So you could almost say that there are two different thoughts going on within yourself. Both parts of your body are trying to find a solution and it is when the two meet. Where it is logical – brain, and when it feels right – body. How does that then transform or translate into a feeling? You just know it is the solution. It just makes sense. And it goes back to – it is just seeing the path through a quagmire of noise, or through a bunch of noise. So you see the direction that you want – that it needs to take. And you see the finish line if you want to call it, or the two ends of the rope meeting together. However you want to phrase it. But it is distilling the noise. It is distilling the noise and keeping it really simple.*

Example 36:

> *It is very hard to try and articulate that. What we end up doing is building great big spreadsheets, and we do great big reports, and we show everything, why this is good. But before you get to that, you have got to say, "I reckon that looks like a really good deal." Okay? If you don't get to that stage, you're never going to do the rest of it. You're not going to do a spreadsheet on something that doesn't look like a really good deal. And you got to – therefore, there's a combination of research. Where the markets are, what markets you like, why you want it to be*

> *there, etcetera. There's a lot of gut in there, because you could say, "This is not a market I want to be in," and something pops up and you think, "Wow, at that price, this could be a standout, because I wouldn't be in the market at X, but I am sure in the market at X minus 30% or 40%." And a lot of that is intuition, I think.*

The first part of Example 34 from "Within myself there's… unresolved in that particular moment" implies a kind of 'connecting' with or 'getting a handle on' the felt sense. The handle in this case is represented by the words 'unease' and 'unresolved' which gives this developer a sense of knowing that an issue is still to be settled. 'Connecting' here is about getting a sense of what needs to be done without necessarily knowing the answer yet. A sense of discomfort and 'unease' mark a lack of resolution which draws the attention of the developer inward towards themselves in an attempt to find a solution (which comes via 'receiving'). This is very resonant of Gendlin's (1996, p. 17) description of the felt sense as having an unclear though unique and unmistakable quality. This lack of clarity that the developer feels interiorly is in fact very helpful in drawing their attention to the issue at hand and allowing a solution to come. In this case, the 'unease' indicates that there is more to come. It implies that gestures of 'listening' and 'receiving' will follow, whilst "I probably need a clear head space" implies a return to 'letting go'.

When asked 'what does time do for you?' this developer responded with: "Allows me to access a whole bunch of options… [When I find the right combination] Then I feel calm" (Example 34). In this instance, 'connecting' with the felt sense and recognising that there is a problem or a lack of resolution has transformed into a longer and more involved process of 'resonating a handle' and/or perhaps 'testing'. The developer is now 'testing' different options against their bodily sense of whether the option that is front of mind is 'fit' for context. They are in a way 'connecting' (which implies 'letting go'), 'listening' and 'receiving' all at once. They are also 'imagining' and 'testing' options as the move about on the 'merry-go-round'. 'Connecting' here appears to rely on some kind of 'letting go' – they need to "get a clear headspace" prior to finding a resolution. There is some kind of recognition that they are not 'connecting' and, therefore, unable (for now) to find a solution, so they turn to 'letting go' as a process to enable 'connecting' and once they find a solution or "the right combination" (Example 34) then they 'feel a sense

of calm’. This points again to an interiorly-oriented sensitivity – a sensitivity to one’s felt bodily processes – as a means to finding and recognising a solution. The meta-transition from ‘unease’ and recognition of a problem, to a solution and ‘a sense of calm’ implies all four interiorly-oriented gestures – the gesture of ‘letting go’ followed by iterations of ‘connecting’, ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’.

The gestures of ‘letting go’, ‘connecting’, ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’ are also alluded to in Example 35. In responding to the questions ‘How do you know which ideas to pursue and which to let go? And how do you recognise a solution?’, this developer refers to a series of bodily or somatosensory responses. It appears that they work through a process of not knowing by allowing different aspects of the body-mind (referred to as ‘the brain’ and ‘the body’) to find some kind of integration. Similarly to Example 34, this implies an interiorly-oriented sense of a lack of fit or ‘unease’ as marker for a matter that is not yet resolved. Coming to a resolution is about “distilling the noise and keeping it really simple”; in their words solutions “just make sense” (Example 35). Similarly in Example 34, recognition of a solution comes in a bodily way – like a felt sense (Gendlin 1996, p. 18). ‘Connecting’ is then primarily about being sensitive enough (interiorly) to recognise when one has found a resolve. This developer knows they do not yet have a solution if there is a sense of misfit between their brain and body. They know a solution when they can “see a path through a quagmire of noise” and/or it “just makes sense” (Example 35). ‘Connecting’ in this Example implies ‘letting go’, ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’. Understanding skilfulness in this way, as a set of microprocesses, is a way of making what goes on in skilful practice accessible and teachable.

Recognition of an idea worth pursuing for this developer (Example 36) comes prior to any kind of in depth technical analysis. Prior to analysis, they need to come to a point something like: "I reckon that looks like a really good deal” because “[i]f you don't get to that stage, you're never going to do the rest of it”. This implies that much of the carrying forward of development processes towards technically rigorous detail is experienced with some kind of sense that an idea is worth ‘testing’. ‘Connecting’ is in this instance a process of turning inward and getting a sense of a situation prior to

'listening' and 'receiving'. Even after technical analysis, a sense of the 'right' next step (albeit of course still fallible) is intuitive to some degree, in the way that it is still a step into the unknown. That is because symbolic representations, a feasibility analysis, for example, are still only partial representations of the whole story. They are a make do course of action that may catalyse delivery. The more intricate and holistic sense of a situation held interiorly is always evolving and more intricate than one can explicate (Gendlin 1996).

In addition, like most commercial activity, much of what property development revolves around is anticipating future needs and demands. It is about having foresight to provide a built product for a particular market at a particular point in time. As in architectural practice (described in Chapter 3), developer practice is about moving forward by taking a degree of risk, and stepping again and again into the unknown. The risks are of course generally magnified for developers. In order to carry the process forward, one must repeatedly make calls as to which particular step to take, and given that no information, expression or communication is ever exhaustive or complete, one who is skilful turns inward to find a somatic or bodily and more texturally rich sense of fit. Perhaps one could take an entirely probabilistic approach. The difficulty is that unlike casino gambling, for example, the development problem space can only be quantified partially and in limited ways, so turning towards a 'feel' for the possibilities is highly functional in the context of property development if the practitioner is experienced.

5.2.2.2 Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'connecting'

'Connecting' is a gesture of finding resonance/dissonance within the body as a means to understanding whether an issue is resolved or requires more attention. In recognising a problem, one often senses 'unease' or 'discomfort' (Example 34), whereas finding a way forward or a solution is often guided by 'intuition' (Example 36), a sense of 'calm' (Example 34) or 'just knowing' (Example 35). In Examples 4, 5 and 6 there appears to be a non-analytical sense of interiorly knowing of the kind that Gendlin (1996) refers to as the felt sense. When considered at a fine resolution, it is interesting to note that the

distinction between 'connecting' and the three other interiorly-oriented gestures is not particularly obvious. It appears that 'connecting' not only implies the other gestures but can also contain them, as is evident in the progressive and iterative integration of the brain/body as a description of finding a solution (Example 35). 'Connecting' in this case guides recognition of a problem (that is, of something not yet resolved) but it also implies the prior gesture of 'letting go' and perhaps almost synchronously the gestures of 'listening' and 'receiving'. It appears that one does not know a problem unless one has received a bodily response.

5.2.3 THE GESTURE OF 'LISTENING' TO ONESELF AND OTHERS

Listening The gesture of 'listening' is a process of priming oneself to pay attention to what may come from the felt sense (that is, from 'receiving'). 'Listening' is characterised by a leaning toward an answer (referred to as 'asking' by Gendlin 1996). 'Listening' is a of a kind of poised attention and evenly distributed bodily scanning which begins after 'letting go' and 'connecting', and comes before 'receiving'.

Note: Adapted from Table 10.1 'Two schemas for listening to ourselves' in Walkerden (2005, p. 182) and replicated in TABLE 4.1 (p. 117).

5.2.3.1 **Examples of 'listening' in property developer practice**

Example 37:

> *Once you understand the people's – once you understand what is motivating someone or what is causing someone – what issues are causing consternation to an individual, you can then have a conversation with them. You can then have a conversation with them that gives them the way forward, and also gives you a way forward, so you might call that good EQ…. So there is no doubt there's an element of that in it. It is also understanding – what are the key points? What are some of the things you have just got to be able to let go? And what are some of the things that are just fundamental? I think too many people focus on the irrelevant factors rather than focusing on the main game. And I would probably rather focus on the two or three, up to five key issues, and get them right. And let go–*

Example 38:

> *And it goes back to – it's just seeing the path through a quagmire of noise, or through a bunch of noise. So you see the direction that you want – that it needs to take. And you see the finish line. If you want to call it, or the two ends of the*

> *rope meeting together. However you want to phrase it. But it's distilling the noise. It's distilling the noise and keeping it really simple.* (An excerpt from Example 32)

Example 39:

> *I think every project has obstacles. I think that it wouldn't be quite a project if there wasn't. I think that the game that we are in is about intuition. There is obviously a science to it. The science – the maths, you run numbers. The numbers are what the numbers are. The art of it is working out a way of obviously increasing revenue and reducing costs and delivering it within a certain time frame. That is a constant challenge and a battle in every project.*

'Listening' in the first part of Example 37 is predominantly about listening to others which enables relationship: "You can then have a conversation with them that gives them the way forward, and also gives you a way forward" (Example 37). 'Listening' to others to find information about particular issues that may keep someone from performing well on a project is a critical part of this developer's practice. At first glance, this kind of 'listening' (as in 'listening' to others or sociomaterially) might appear to be quite different from Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot's (1999) descriptions of asking/listening respectively (refer TABLE 4.1, p. 117) but this is not necessarily so. Walkerden (2005), makes the obvious but not often considered point that 'listening' to others hinges on 'listening' to yourself. That is, heeding how one is responding in a bodily or felt way is crucial to understanding someone else, and more generally, social processes are inherently intrapersonal. So, 'listening' socially in this case implies 'listening' to oneself as the felt sense is always in relation to what is being received. It is an evolving and iterative process of 'getting a handle' on what is being said (and perhaps also not said in nonverbal cues). In other words, it is a process of finding a symbolic representation, albeit perhaps interiorly only, that fits both what is being said (and not said but is relevant) and the felt sense.

The second part of Example 37: "It is also understanding – what are the key points?… And I would probably rather focus on the two or three, up to five key issues, and get them right. And let go– " brings another aspect of 'listening' to the fore. It illustrates how 'listening' to issues that may need attention in relation to a particular matter

implies some kind of exclusivity. Even 'listening' in a way that is "panoramic and very discriminating" (Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999, p. 18) implies some kind of exclusion because one is limiting in some way what one is 'listening' for. There is skill, of course, in being able to discern what should be prioritised and what should be let go in the context of commercial activity. Development projects are like any other in that demands on time and resources need to be managed. A significant part of being skilful as a manager is being able to discriminate critical inputs and what really matters from those that are nice to have.

This developer (Example 38), whose approach to 'connecting' was discussed previously when drawing on the same excerpt, relies on 'listening' as a way to "see the path through a quagmire of noise". There is an acute 'listening' to oneself and to one's environment implied in this. The reference to 'quagmire' suggests that at times there is a lot going on that can cloud one's ability to see a way forward. "Distilling the noise" is a process of reducing interiorly-oriented tensions. These tensions or 'noise' may be directly linked to the issue at hand or they may come from somewhere else. Either way, this "noise" cannot be recognised and understood unless one is 'listening' and hears it. Equally, 'letting go', 'connecting' and 'receiving' are implied in this Example. 'Letting go' is a necessary step to 'distilling noise', 'connecting' is about priming oneself to listen, and 'receiving' is about what may come (for example, a clearer understanding of the situation). There is a very clear leaning toward a solution or goal of some kind here: "So you see the direction that you want… And you see the finish line". It is as if this developer knows where they want to go, that is, they have a sense of what getting there will look like, but the outcomes emerge as part of a process and that process is a lot about 'letting go' and 'listening'.

The gesture of 'listening' is more implied than explicated in Example 39. 'Challenging and battling' through obstacles appears to be an accepted, and indeed expected, part of the process: "every project has obstacles… it wouldn't be quite a project if there wasn't". This implies 'listening' because attending to obstacles hinges on being able to recognise them in the first place. One must of course be 'listening' in order to hear that

a particular issue needs attention. "I think that the game that we are in is about intuition" suggests that this practitioner does not have calculative and rational practice at the centre of their decision-making process (see Schön 1983). They see development as partly scientific (perhaps implying technical rationality Schön 1983) but as mostly artistic. "The art of it is working out a way of obviously increasing revenue and reducing costs and delivering it within a certain time frame" (Example 39) that is, in attending to tensions between increasing revenue, reducing costs and delivering on time (and presumably also meeting quality targets). Time, cost and quality of course represent the well documented 'project management triangle'. What is particularly interesting about the evolving dynamic between time, revenues/cost (and quality) is that this reference to such tensions implies a continual process of 'listening' from inception until completion. 'Listening' and the prior gestures of 'letting go' and 'connecting' and the following gesture of 'receiving' are very likely taking place throughout the design and delivery process, from first intuition until divestment. They are very likely taking place beyond practical completion to the extent that a developer has a vested interest.

5.2.3.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'listening'**

For developers, 'listening' is about recognising and understanding issues that may arise. It implies gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting' and 'receiving'. It is through 'listening' interiorly to oneself that one is then able to hear others and the sociomaterial aspects of design and delivery. 'Listening' enables one to discern what is and what is not critical in order to successfully design and deliver a project. 'Listening' shows a commitment to heeding the intuitive as the centre of the decision-making process rather than the calculated, technical and/or rational (as discussed by Schön 1983). 'Listening' is not all intuition, however, as it implies one has already chosen to listen for or to something, whether it is an issue in relation to a project or personnel etc., so there is some kind of cognitive process at play. One does not just listen aimlessly – if one is doing so skilfully one listens to what one knows needs attention. This sense of knowing comes from 'letting go' and 'connecting' with the felt sense.

5.2.4 THE GESTURE OF 'RECEIVING' THE FELT SENSE

Receiving
'Receiving' is about heeding the felt sense. It points to a stirring in the felt sense; to receive is to let this stirring or experiential process step be, even if it seems out of place or unrealistic (Gendlin 1996). What may start as a stirring in the felt sense is then resonated with (or 'tested' against) symbolic representations such as words, images and/or feelings. This process of 'resonating a handle' is about making sense of what comes via 'receiving'. One aspires to having a sense of integration between the felt sense and the symbol/s used to represent it in relation to a particular aspect of experiencing. It is a process which culminates in a moment of insight or 'aha!'. 'Receiving' is the moment of intuition which illuminates the next step. It is experienced as a sense of knowing and implies 'letting go', 'connecting' and 'listening'.

Adapted from Table 10.1 'Two schemas for listening to ourselves' in Walkerden (2005, p. 182) and replicated in TABLE 4.1 (p. 117).

5.2.4.1 **Examples of 'receiving' in property developer practice**

Example 40:

> *How do I know? I* [laughter] *have a gut feel for it. How do I know? I think it's just through the… Really, I smell it. That's the honest truth. So, I just know. I just know…Yeah, I don't see visions or images. I mean, I just know where there is a good opportunity. I can sense what is appealing to buyers. I can see simpleness* [sic] *within complexity. Does that make sense?* (excerpt from Example 32).

Example 41:

> *And assuming that part of the answers are not going to be obvious and part of them might come from within, but part of them might come from other people that you're interacting with. Often you can have a solution stimulated by an interaction with team members or colleagues where they are not actually aware that they are contributing to your solution. You can actually just get something out of an interaction and say, "Hang on, that is going to help me solve this problem." That is not going to happen unless your antennae are up. I think you need to – it is active listening, it is emotional intelligence, it is all those things about being aware, how to read signals and* [how they] *apply to a different context.*

Example 42:

> *But that was a purely instinctive, massive leap of faith or a very, very big appetite for a very big risk because in those days that was quite a bit of money for us. So that was to me – I saw it as an opportunity. I didn't have time to really do much because I had to go overseas. I literally looked Monday, exchanged contracts Tuesday, went on Wednesday. Came back, we settled it and came back, and then*

> *started to look and said, "Oh my God. This is all full of columns." I didn't even think of it, but then as it happened it became a very, very successful cash cow for us.*

'Receiving' in Example 40 is about having a gut feel for a situation and how to proceed. This developer is not able to articulate how they know but they are able to point to a kind of interiorly-oriented bodily sense as a marker for their knowing. 'Receiving' and recognising an opportunity comes from a 'gut feel', and a 'sense' or 'smell' which signals that they 'just know' (Example 40). This is interesting because it draws attention to the non-analytical character of having a 'feel' for a situation and knowing a right way forward. Whilst they may not know how they know, they do recognise an opportunity and this recognition comes through a process of 'receiving' an interiorly-oriented sense. They "can sense what is appealing to buyers"; they "can see simpleness [sic] within complexity". 'Receiving' in this way appears to be a kind of holistic and intricate sense of, or knowing about, a situation much like Gendlin's (1996) 'getting a handle on the felt sense'. This knowing is not understood analytically (at least at first) but rather implies analysis as a next step – in this case perhaps more market research.

Example 41 is particularly illuminating when considered in the communicative planning frame that knowledge is generated interactively (Forester 1989; Healey 1997; Innes 1995). This developer sees problem-solving as at times interiorly-oriented and at other times sociomaterially oriented. The interactivity is there in both cases, and 'receiving' is about 'listening' to oneself and 'listening' to others – it is a social and an intrapersonal process. These interactions are not always intended to resolve problems but if one's "antennae are up" that may be just what happens. This implies a kind of 'letting go' embedded in the process, there is force associated with interactions but rather an openness to finding a solution (i.e. 'receiving'). Perhaps active listening as it is referred to here is actually 'listening-and-receiving' (which implies 'letting go, and 'connecting'). It appears that 'letting go' and 'receiving' are taking place iteratively as part of interactions, whether they are more interiorly- or socially-oriented. 'Letting go',

'connection' and 'listening' are precursors in this case to 'receiving' which comes as a result of socialising. A kind of 'receiving' from others and from oneself is at play.

Example 42 highlights the uncertainty and risk associated with 'receiving', despite feeling that *it* is the right decision to make at the time. 'Receiving' in this instance is in a way interestingly resonant and may be tied to 'letting go'. There is an openness and vulnerability – and perhaps a little naiveté or at least acceptance of one's fallibility in not really knowing what will come – in making the decision to purchase this site. Such a decision is characterised as "a massive leap of faith" and a "big risk". It paid off in the end but that pay off took some time and patience, and not all went to plan – as is clear in the surprise presence of columns in the internal layout of the building. Despite not having done a lot of research, perhaps not even an internal site inspection, this developer felt compelled to commit to purchasing the site. 'Receiving' as it is seen here is a kind of hunch or instinct. 'Receiving' and acting on such intuitions is no guarantee of success, and this developer knows that risk and not knowing is characteristic of their work. Sometimes these kinds of leaps of faith pay off as it did in the longer term in this case, and presumably sometimes they do not. Despite the sense of knowing that comes from 'receiving' and prompts a decision in a certain direction, there are surprises along the way.

5.2.4.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'receiving'**

The gesture of 'receiving' refers to instances where one feels a sense of knowing in relation to an issue or situation. 'Receiving' is a process of coming to terms with the 'right' next step – that is, a sense of integration or fit between the felt sense and the step to come (which is iteratively being received and 'resonated with a handle' or symbolic representation). 'Receiving' can be seen in different ways: coming to know that a particular move is 'right' (Example 40); interacting socially which sparks some kind of insight or resolution, intentionally or not (Example 41); or a more impetuous instinct to take a leap of faith (Example 42). It is a non-linear, non-rational process of intuiting the 'right' way forward which feels correct at the time but may, and almost certainly will,

come with unintended consequences. 'Receiving' relies on the prior gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting' and 'listening'. As seen in Chapter 4, these four gestures hang together as a micropractice – without all four, no insights would emerge from one's embeddedness in the situation.

5.3 GESTURES OF DESIGNING IN DEVELOPER PRACTICE

In addition to a series of interiorly-oriented gestures that enable developers to think skilfully from their bodily felt embeddedness in situations discussed in section 5.2, the data also reveals a series of gestures which emphasise engaging with the social and material aspects of professional circumstances. The gestures of the 'metaprocess of designing' observed in architectural practice (refer Chapter 4) are also prominent in private developer practice although with a few key differences. Developers tend to rely on such gestures primarily as a means to understanding and anticipating property market dynamics as opposed to just understanding the particular demographic that one is designing for (which was more prominent in Chapter 4). Evidence for the importance of these is provided in the following sections.

5.3.1 THE GESTURE OF 'IMMERSING' ONESELF IN THE PROJECT CONTEXT

Immersing
The gesture of 'immersing' refers to the way information is selected and absorbed as a means to 'getting and resonating a handle' on project scope and conditions. At the early stages of a project, developers seek out information in an attempt to understand opportunities and constraints, and to provoke potential solutions. 'Immersing' is primarily about searching for ('listening') and finding ('receiving') context-relevant information. It is primarily a process of coming to terms with project conditions and key stakeholder interests.

Adapted from the description of 'immersing' for architectural practice in section 4.3.1.

5.3.1.1 **Examples of 'immersing' in property developer practice**

Example 43:

> *Look, firstly generally even a first time purchaser these days is pretty savvy, because it is most unlikely that they just walked into our property and say, "That's it, we'll buy." Mostly they will have looked at several. And firstly, they are pretty*

> *savvy and they might not be able to explain, but generally they say, "This is a good apartment, it feels spacious, no waste of space, built-ins here, built-ins there, nice kitchen." And they can tell a badly designed and a badly finished apartment from a good one.*

Example 44:

> *We don't have any input from the end user. We don't. But just, a feeling of what has worked in the past. What we think is not going to polarise people. Something that we don't do is go left field with the design and the colour scheme… marketable, so that doesn't polarize. Pretty much in track record in the field of what we've done previously. We've made some mistakes along the line – very few – but we made some mistakes and we won't try that again.*

Example 45:

> *Being aware of what is going on in the real world marketplace. Being aware of innovation. Being aware of the changing needs of people, compared to different generations, so the different demographics that you deliver your product in, or locations in where your demographic is most likely to buy. Surveying people, talking to people, getting as much feedback as possible, and not believe that what we do today – never believing that what we do today is acceptable tomorrow.*

Example 43 illustrates the gesture of 'immersing' via the perceived appreciation of buyer ability to know a good design, or something they like. This developer is keenly aware of increasing buyer discernment and has taken this on board as part of knowing and understanding the property market within which they work. Such an appreciation comes through a process of 'immersing' oneself in and 'listening' and 'receiving' market information. 'Immersing' in this instance is a kind of 'listening' and 'receiving' interiorly and sociomaterially. This does not necessarily mean going out and speaking directly with purchasers but it does mean getting to know them somehow, and therefore, implies prior gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' because one comes to a sense of knowing through these gestures. "A good apartment" in this case refers to the purchaser's subjective feel for the sequencing of space and materials; it does not necessarily refer to good quality in general, but it still matters because understanding the market is critical to securing sales revenue. So 'immersing' in this case is about attempting to situate oneself in the experiencing and expectations of a purchaser through processes of 'listening' and 'receiving' interiorly (to oneself) and sociomaterially

(to others). This particular Example does perhaps cross into the territory of 'imagining' as well – one can consider 'imagining' oneself in the shoes of a purchaser as a part of 'immersing' oneself in the market. Perhaps it is also an example of 'testing' the market. While developers are experts in their field, they are no more expert in living and working in built product than anyone else, and skilful developers as seen here appear to be especially sensitive to this and to the wisdom of buyers in knowing and expressing their needs.

Example 44 reiterates some of what was seen in Example 43. In this case, however, the developer is keenly aware of the distance between them and a buyer and so they rely more on "what has worked in the past" (Example 44). 'Immersing' here is about shaping a marketable and saleable product in the face of distance or a lack of interactivity between them and the buyer. They rely on what has worked before and seek to design in a way that does not polarise or offend people. This is about capturing as many sales as possible by creating a product that is more generic and, therefore, inclusive. The reliance on the past to inform the future is interesting because it implies limiting creativity and innovation, the underlying assumption being that if a certain product has sold before, it will probably sell again. This is smart if what society needs is more generic and middle of the road built product, but is a little concerning if what society needs is built product that does more than just meet the basic needs of the many. Overall perhaps, this kind of attitude, which appears to stem with good commercial reasoning and from an understanding of the property market, puts innovation and creativity at risk, especially those aspects of built form which are not explicitly discussed in property negotiations or sales contracts, such as how the space will make one feel. If most developers look to the past for guidance on the future, as this one does, there is unlikely to be much innovation on the horizon, unless of course developers do things differently in response to what did not work, in which case innovation and creativity are likely to play a role in evolving built form in response to past failures. 'Immersing' then is as much about 'listening' and 'receiving' what is said as it is about 'listening' to and 'receiving' what is not said.

The developer in Example 45 also refers to 'immersing' in relation to the property market. Interestingly, however, they highlight the importance of: "Being aware of innovation. Being aware of the changing needs of people". It appears that they listen to the way the market has been as a means to anticipating the way that it will be. They make contact with people and 'get as much feedback as possible' so they can 'get a handle on' the likelihood of changes to come. 'Immersing' here is about 'receiving' context relevant information such as what people may demand in the future. This draws attention to the evolving and dynamic nature of property markets, and the ways developers must attend to such changes if they are to survive. Perhaps this reliance on understanding buyers is not so obvious in high density and high population in developed Western nations where entry to the property development game is largely limited to those with large amounts of equity and a good track record that enables them to secure funding. Perhaps it is also not so true in the case of bearish property markets when demand well outstrips supply. Nonetheless, a developer that is not iteratively and persistently 'immersing' themselves in the property market they wish to serve is likely to be left behind commercially.

5.3.1.2 Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'immersing'

It appears that in developer practice, 'immersing' is most often linked in some way to an understanding of the property market. Through this gesture, developers 'get a handle on' what (they think) people will (and will not) want, and are then able to make appropriate adjustments to their product design prior to sale. More in depth 'immersing' typically takes place early on in the development process, prior to marketing and sales. That is because once sales have been made, design development becomes more about refinement towards delivery and less about radical change to the built form. A reasonable understanding of the market prior to making the product available for purchase is critical to securing sales revenue, and 'immersing' oneself in the shoes of purchasers through empathetic engagement by surveying locals, walking the streets, reading market reports etc. are examples of how developers do this. 'Immersing' is, therefore, a gesture of understanding property markets and potential purchasers in

order to secure sales, and this often means keeping radical innovations or anything a little eccentric to a minimum (as referred to explicitly in Example 44) unless of course they are in demand. Perhaps this explains part of why so much of what is built now appears to be generic and a commodified rather than an aesthetic response to circumstances.

5.3.2 THE GESTURE OF 'IMAGINING' THE PROPOSED DESIGN

Imagining
'Imagining' typically follows the gesture of 'immersing' and refers to the way developers provoke an 'image' out of felt understanding of a situation, prior to and as part of, seeking to bring an 'image' to life in built product. The 'image' here is more than 'the handle' one might have when 'receiving' because it becomes a complex artefact. It is a process of 'getting and resonating a handle' on one's felt experiencing of how to carry forward a particular development opportunity toward completion.

Adapted from the description of 'imagining' for architectural practice in section 4.3.2.

5.3.2.1 **Examples of 'imagining' in property developer practice**

Example 46:

> *I can look at the site and I straight away see what this site would look like in three or four or five years' time. And I can completely picture in my mind the type of building it will have on it. If I could draw it for you – but tell me a site and I could draw – "I think that should go on it" and "that is a good site for that reason and not a good site for other reasons.*

Example 47:

> *Firstly we absolutely minimise waste, wasted space. And you know this is again, just as I have told you, the decision-making process in acquiring a site is the most difficult part of development by far. The important next stage is to make sure you get the right type of building on the site. And then within that data of building we have the best possible internal layouts. We have an absolute fetish you know, poring through and I can sometimes look all night for just little bits and say, "Why should that kitchen be here, not there? If it was here, wouldn't that be a better aspect?" Or how can we save that dead corner? So every single layout of every single apartment layout that is being reviewed by half a dozen people, separately. And then you should be here when we review it together. It is like a bloody circus.*

Example 48:

> *You know, some things might actually be natural. You know, in the retail game I used to just work with “if it doesn't flow like water, it won't work”. So if there wasn't a natural flow for the consumer and where they could visually see the retailers, we would change the design… And often the plans put in front of you, you'd say, "No, this is just a lot of bricks and mortar put together, it is not flowing. It might look nice but it is not flowing”.*

The ‘imagining’ seen in Example 46 is similar to that described in the architectural practice data (refer Chapter 3) where it presents as a process of building contextual understanding. This developer relies on ‘imagining’ as a way to envision (and perhaps test) the potential of a development site without having done very much analysis at all. They are confident that if given a site they could ‘draw’ what “should go on it”, meaning that they will have a sense of what will work despite not having had time to do a lot of research. Of course, a part of this is likely be grounded in an already rich understanding of the locale resulting from many years in the industry and prior processes of ‘immersing’, however, it does point to a kind of non-analytical approach to creating an ‘image’ which one then works to bring into built product. ‘Imagining’ in this case is a process that enables one to develop a ‘picture in one’s mind’ of what might be possible and viable on a particular site. This ‘image’ may be visual but it may also be kinaesthetic, for example. In this way, it comes after a process of ‘immersing’ as it relies on some kind of understanding of the site or at least knowing of a particular site, and appears to take place before more complex technical analysis and the gesture ‘testing’.

Example 47 makes it easy to see how development processes begin with the abstract and proceed toward detail. This developer refers to a typical sequence of events in purchasing a site, determining the highest and best land use (commercial, retail, residential etc. – which may or may not be permissible) and then shaping the ‘data of the building’ (i.e. internal layouts). In this instance, ‘imagining’ is about seeing development potential in a site and then working one’s way down to the architectural detail that enables realisation. It is about developing an ‘image’ of built product that begins as an inkling of the development potential of a site and ends in ‘testing’ the

placement of cupboards in a kitchen, for example. It is interesting to note here how developer practice extends beyond that of architects. Developers typically work with a wider set of stakeholder interests than architects (such as planning authorities, financiers, land owners, purchasers as longer term customers/clients etc.). Architects, of course, have an interest in attending to design in a way that enables delivery. Developers, however, work more broadly and often sociopolitically for longer periods on particular projects and/or locales. Their work extends from inception (perhaps site acquisition or site control, or a change in zoning controls of a site already under ownership) to practical completion, while architects typically work from concept design through to detailed architectural documentation and perhaps some role in superintending construction. Developers are, however, at all times the ones with the most skin in the game so to speak, as their equity and livelihood is tied up with meeting the needs of the market and those of other stakeholders who rely on their success, such as financiers. With this in mind, it is perhaps not surprising that developers involve themselves in careful reviewing of internal layouts, and 'imagining' themselves in the shoes of potential purchasers and/or clients much as was described by architects in Chapter 3.

Both 'immersing' and 'imagining' are present in Example 48 as illustrated by: "if it doesn't flow like water, it won't work". This particular phrase points to a kind of visceral or somatosensory understanding of how water moves (naturally). This developer uses their felt understanding of the movement of water to assess whether a particular design layout or sequence is appropriate. With each retail design they attempt to find a "natural flow for the consumer" and not "just a lot of bricks and mortar". 'Imagining' in this case refers to placing oneself 'in the shoes of' water and also customers who like to 'flow' (and perhaps spend more money as they do). It is a gesture grounded in an intricate understanding of consumer behaviour through 'immersing' which amounts to iteratively putting oneself in the felt experiencing of consumers and resonating (or 'testing') this with one's sense of how water and people tend to 'flow'. In this case, 'imagining' is about 'testing' the layout against what is needed (that is, a design that flows like water). The design in this case is not fit for purpose until it resonates with the natural flow of water

which is a symbolic representation or metaphor for how people like to move when they shop. This is another reflection of the importance of developers understanding their market, in this case retail consumers who feed the revenues of retail suites and enable them to pay rent.

5.3.2.2 Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'imagining'

The gesture of 'imagining' here implies a prior process of 'immersing' and some kind of understanding of the project or task at hand. A decision to purchase a site requires knowledge of the site but does not necessarily require deeper knowledge such as site conditions or development rights, planning controls etc., although this may be helpful. Developers rely on 'imagining' primarily to anticipate the needs of property markets and/or those who inhabit their built product or portfolio. When one assumes that developers are predominantly motivated by financial reward now or in the future, it is perhaps not surprising to see that these participants involve themselves in design work in similar ways to architects (as seen in Chapter 4). What is perhaps most interesting is the felt sensitivity with which developers attempt to place themselves in the shoes of their customer/client base. It appears they pay attention to the felt sense as a way to empathetically engage with their market, even though in reality they may not know much about them at all. This process of 'imagining' runs from site acquisitions through to the smallest details of kitchen layouts, and the way people are anticipated and expected to move through and experience built space.

5.3.3 THE GESTURE OF 'TESTING' AND REFINING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

Testing
'Testing' is primarily a gesture of finding a more refined fit between the felt sense and a symbolic representation (i.e. word, image or feeling). It is a process of checking the intricacies of an 'image' (architectural or construction detail of the imagined space, for example) in order to carry the project closer toward practical completion. 'Testing' offers a way for property developers to check the soundness of their preliminary intuitions (which come from 'immersing and 'imagining') against more intricate and complex technical requirements. 'Testing' relies on prior gestures of 'immersing' and 'imagining' (and the underlying gestures of problem-solving) as means to generate ideas worth evaluating (or 'testing').

Adapted from the description of 'testing' for architectural practice in section 4.3.3.

5.3.3.1 **Examples of 'testing' in property developer practice**

Example 49:

> *I think I drew upon a lot of stuff in the back of my mind that just won't allow me to accept the situation as I see it unchallenged. So I like to challenge things and assume that if it unfolded a different way what would be that outcome? So some of it is testing options in the back of my own mind and challenging even if I feel that something's heading down the right track, not being content with that, but saying, "Look," I guess looking and searching for the weaknesses or the better paths or a better avenue.*

Example 50:

> *We really roll the dice. We roll the dice each time. But it's also the old guestimate, and the measures sort of punt – we're taking a punt* [bet]. *It's a bit of a measured punt. We don't do anything that's going to really isolate people. That's going to – if someone is going to come in, and say, "That looks – God, that looks horrible." So what? We really take the middle ground, and just veer off occasionally. Does that sort of make any sense to you?*

Example 51:

> *But that was pure risk taking and a bit of instinctive feeling that I can't go too wrong with it. I wouldn't do this today, because anything we do today is much larger and takes a lot longer to develop. So these days we do a huge amount of studies and we call in* [a preferred consultant] *and we call in all sorts of consultants, even though we probably have some of the best development people in the country, apart from our construction team. And we still do massive, massive studies on every site.*

The developer in Example 49 is responding to a question on how they know they are on the 'right' track. It appears they rely mainly on the gesture of 'testing' as a means to know whether a particular 'image' or idea is valid or should be reconsidered. They ask themselves questions such as: "if it unfolded a different way what would be that outcome?". 'Testing' for this developer is a matter of seeing whether what they think as a fitting solution is still appropriate given different sets of circumstances. This developer relies on 'testing' in a way that is very resonant of what was seen in Chapter 4. To them it is about "looking and searching for the weaknesses or the better paths or a better avenue". 'Imagining' is at play here as well, as the practice description implies that this developer places themselves inside an 'image' (perhaps an element of a design or project) and imagines certain scenarios taking place in order to test for strengths and weaknesses. 'Testing' in this case is a kind of interiorly-oriented SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats).

In Example 50, 'testing' is described as part of the professional territory: "We roll the dice each time". The idea that one is 'guesstimating' with every move implies that what one is in fact doing is 'testing' whether such moves fit (or still fit) the context. The reference to decisions being "a bit of a measured punt" implies something similar. There is some kind of understanding of what might work, but it is preliminary and tentative, until it has been tested. Uncertainty, risk and travelling into the unknown are to the fore here as part of the development process. There is no failsafe method for realising one's objective beyond progressively 'testing' one's ideas against the market (and trying not to polarise the market) but even then it is still a 'measured punt'. Development here is not (often) about delivering bespoke built product suitable for a few. Most of the time it is about 'taking the middle ground' and attracting as many potential purchasers as possible (simple demand-supply preferences). This implies that one must have knowledge of the market and what works and does not work more broadly, perhaps by way of 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing', and learning from experience. 'Testing' for this developer is a form of risk mitigation against isolating their product from a broader market.

Example 51 is a description of the difference in the kind of 'testing' this developer did some time ago versus the kind of 'testing' they (and the organisation they oversee) do today. It appears increases in scale and risk have prompted them to put more extensive analytical processes in place. Where earlier their 'testing' was perhaps more intuitive and based on instinct or gut feel for a situation, these days decision-making is backed up by "massive, massive studies on every site", principally because there are a lot more people with a vested interest in how things are run. What is perhaps also interesting to contemplate is whether such a clean switch to rational decision-making as described here is really how it looks. At least from this data, one can say with some confidence that a sense of knowing tends in the first instance in most cases to come from something more holistic, felt and intuitive. Perhaps it is truer in this instance to say that intuition still plays a critical and perhaps foundational role in provoking certain strategic directions and that these 'massive studies' are in fact a way of 'testing' such intuitions.

5.3.3.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'testing'**

'Testing' as is described here is a way for developers to strengthen their likelihood of meeting property market demands. Example 49 is an illustration of a developer 'testing' scenarios to strengthen a project; Example 50 highlights the uncertainty of development activity and foregrounds 'testing' as means of risk management; and Example 51 is a description of 'testing' as an alternative to a more intuitive approach but may in fact be a way to check the rationale of one's intuitions. In each of these cases, 'testing' is crucial as a means to checking the validity of one's symbolic representations and the assumptions contained therein against one's sense of what will work.

5.3.4 THE GESTURE OF 'PERSEVERING' AND EXTENDING

Persevering
The gesture of 'persevering' refers to a decision to continue in a particular direction. 'Persevering' is at play when one feels a sense of integration between the felt sense and the 'image' they have in mind. In doing so, they sense they are on the 'right' path and so continue in a similar or somewhat anticipated direction. It is a process step of persisting with and extending on an earlier step, as opposed to 'unwinding' (which is discussed next). In some instances, 'persevering' can be considered an act of defiance in the face of opposition of some kind.

Adapted from the description of 'persevering' for architectural practice in section 4.3.4.

5.3.4.1 **Examples of 'persevering' in property developer practice**

Example 52:

> *Refusal – refusal to fail. So yeah, determination, fear of failure, call it what you will but not letting the situation get the better of me. Probably ultimately, even though at times it does and it did. Ultimately believing in yourself. It's probably believing in yourself that at some point, it will pay off, the hard work. I believe in hard work paying off from believing in yourself. Giving your all and that hard work pays off. So a combination of those things in roughly equal measures.*

Example 53:

> *Let's play their game. Push it over as far as you can comply that side. We just fiddle around with these and make them a bit more – we lost a lot of up and overs – a lot of singles in turn for the up and overs. But we came back with 38 units but they weren't as good as the original concept. So the amenity in the 36 units was a hell of a lot better.*

Example 54:

> *Oh yes, there have been a few of those situations where for whatever reason there was someone who might have – a consultant or something – might have had a relationship already in the project but you've had to use them and you knew at the beginning it wouldn't have been your choice of consultant but you've had to persist. There have been a few of those situations where – but I think in many of those situations, it may have resulted in a less than ideal outcome but I think you develop some resilience and ability to adapt to the situation and you just get the best out* [of] *people you can at the time. And really I think when you are working well as a team, unless they're an entirely destructive character, you want to get the best out of someone even if you feel that they're not capable of producing the best. Instinctively, you want to try and get the best out of them. It may not be the best, but if it's going to endanger the outcome of the project then obviously you need to make a tough decision and change consultants or whatever it is.*

Example 52 shows a developer reflecting on how they make it through significant challenges. They refer to various attitudes as supportive: 'determination, fear of failure, not letting the situation get the better of me, believing in oneself'. Each carries a quality of 'persevering' despite difficulty or obstacles. For this developer, 'persevering' is both an attitude and a process of continuing on. 'Persevering' is a way of succeeding – of making it through various obstacles; of refusing to fail. This is perhaps an important part of developer practice given that with every step one risks not getting it 'right' and/or perhaps getting it very wrong. Property development is a high-risk/high-return enterprise which relies greatly on one's ability to discern opportunities at the right time. That is, it relies on a kind of integration between critical aspects of development activity such as a site, development rights (or perhaps noncompliant opportunities which hinge on political influence), architectural design, project finance, property market etc. 'Persevering' through and finding ways to address challenges that may appear insurmountable is a crucial part of the game.

Example 53 is an illustration of 'persevering' in response to feeling cornered or threatened by another developer. The other developer had attempted to buy a portion of this developer's site, and because this offer was considered inappropriate and rejected, the other developer who was larger and perhaps financially or politically more powerful then attempted counter strategies. Finally, this participant was required to amend their residential scheme because an aspect of their site became inaccessible (due to what they insinuated was obnoxious behaviour). Although they were able to make the new scheme work and at a reasonable profit, it was to the detriment of the future inhabitants. Here 'persevering' is about making the necessary changes to a design in order to meet one's targets. It is unfortunate that these two competitors could not find a solution that suited both of their interests (i.e. win-win, which in this case appeared indeed possible), however that they did not is perhaps unsurprising given the often highly-competitive and cut-throat environment of property development. In this instance, both developers and purchasers were detrimentally effected.

Example 54 refers to 'persevering' in the context of having to work with someone who appears less than ideal for the job: "*you develop some resilience and ability to adapt to the situation and you just get the best out people you can at the time".* This might be, for example, because they have prior experience on the project or an aspect of it, or because they have useful political relationships. 'Persevering' here is about knowing how 'to get the best out of someone' even though there are certain aspects of this relationship (or their relationship with others) that does not make this easy. There is a 'letting go' in responding to difficulty in this way, with less resistance becoming a way to 'adapt' and continue towards completion. 'Persevering' in this case appears to point to putting one's more personal interests aside in the interests of the project.

5.3.4.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'persevering'**

The gesture of 'persevering' is one of staying on course despite opposition or difficulty of some kind. Developers rely on 'persevering' throughout the development process as they come face to face with unintended or unanticipated consequences which are on occasion disruptive. 'Persevering' can be seen in one's demeanour and commitment to making it through challenges (Example 52); to making things work despite being pushed by others in unexpected directions (Example 53); and to working effectively (especially socially) in less than ideal relational dynamics (Example 54). In some ways 'persevering' always implies 'letting go' and 'unwinding', and a series of other associated gestures already discussed, because it is about moving forward from what was towards completion of some kind.

5.3.5 THE GESTURE OF 'UNWINDING' AND STEPPING BACK TO MOVE FORWARD

Unwinding
The gesture of 'unwinding' refers to a process of discontinuation or reversal. This gesture offers developers a way of 'letting go' of a particular direction to find another (perhaps better) way. A process of 'unwinding' does not imply that one made a mistake but rather that after having taken a few steps and tested the implications of those steps against one's intentions or 'image', one recognises that there is perhaps a better way to take the project toward completion. In some instances, 'unwinding' is considered an act of surrender in the face of opposition or obstruction of some kind but it is not always that. In other cases, 'unwinding' may come about from simply recognising another and more fitting way.

Adapted from the description of 'unwinding' for architectural practice in section 4.3.5.

5.3.5.1 **Examples of 'unwinding' in property developer practice**

Example 55:

> *…I can only speak for myself there, but I have always been overly imaginative, even as a kid and I always had a huge appetite to take risks. Fortunately, I had people around me who slowed me down, even these days, but when I started I took massive risks. I enjoyed taking risks, but I'm a lot less of a risk taker because I'm not allowed, even though I own the business. Often I'll say 'this' and they'll say, "Come on,* [participants name]*, no way. We don't have the budget. We only have x-dollar capital and there are better things." "Okay, fine." But from my part I think I've always had a pretty wild imagination and I'm not adverse to risk taking. And I think I understand the dynamics of locations where nothing's still, the people who live there or are likely to be there, and that to a large extent comes from experience. To some extent it is intuitive. So I'm fortunate that I have got a reasonable intuition in this area where I'm bloody hopeless in a lot of other areas.*

Example 56:

> *They can be inhibiting or restrictive in what you're doing but you can't fight those things you can't change. You have to end up working around them and working with them. From environmental stuff, to how you work with councils, to banks on financial institutions, to regulatory frameworks; you have to work with them. We generally try and get involved in some, where for example we have roadblocks coming up with state governments departments, we'll work with those who work with us and work with those and try to get around issues through elevating them, and escalating them, even up to ministerial level if it's an important issue. Sometimes that helps, but you can't do that too often.*

Example 57:

> *And you build on that time and time again. You've got to be prepared to make mistakes and there is an unwillingness – people are scared to make mistakes. To me nothing is a mistake, it is a decision that was the wrong decision at that point in time. You go ahead and make another one.*

The experience of 'unwinding' illustrated by Example 55 is at least in part about being told by other members of the organisation that the kinds of risks this developer would like to take are simply not possible: "I'm a lot less of a risk taker because I'm not allowed, even though I own the business". This is interesting because it implies 'unwinding' on the part of this developer, 'persevering' on the part of those slowing them down, and perhaps 'persevering' at a coarser organisational resolution in terms of finding a good fit between opportunities and risk – that is, finding alignment between the kinds of projects taken on and the broader business branding and strategy. It shows how what can look like 'unwinding' and 'letting go' from one perspective can be 'persevering' from a different perspective.

Whilst this participant has a high appetite for risk and this has served them well, they are open to being convinced that there is a better way, despite apparently being in a position to overrule this kind of tempering. 'Letting go', 'connecting', listening' and 'receiving' are also implied in Example 55. Perhaps after having had certain aspects (or limits) of the opportunity or business drawn to their attention, this developer decided for themselves that their ideas were not so fitting, or perhaps they are somehow being overpowered by the 'persevering' of others. In both cases, 'unwinding' is evident as a matter of unravelling from a certain direction in order to try and create something more fitting. It is also interesting to note that this developer makes a link between 'imagining' as potentially beneficial but risky: "Fortunately, I had people around me who slowed me down". It is as if they acknowledge that there are limits to 'imagining' and there are times when grounding in more technical details results, appropriately, in 'letting go' of an idea. For this developer, success is 'to some extent intuitive' so they are "fortunate that [they] have got a reasonable intuition in this area [because they are] bloody hopeless in a lot of other areas" (Example 55). Perhaps then, 'listening' to others and

their sometimes less imaginative and more grounded rationale (as described in this Example) is complementary to their practice of deploying intuition in highly creative ways.

In Example 56, this developer recognises the futility in resisting “things you can’t change” and working with whatever comes: “You have to end up working around them and working with them… you have to work with them”. ‘Unwinding’ and ‘persevering’ are apparent in going around an obstacle where one lets go of one way of doing things in order to follow another (perhaps more fruitful) path to completion. ‘Persevering’ is also apparent in working with others despite opposing interests. ‘Letting go’, ‘connecting’, ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’ are implied within each of these approaches as they both rely on having a sense of the ‘right’ next step (that is, in the case of ‘persevering’ and ‘unwinding’ either to push forward or unravel). The reference to escalating issues (meaning to take them to a higher authority) is interesting because it implies ‘letting go’ and/or ‘unwinding’ from trying to work with a certain person or department, and pushing forward or ‘persevering’ by taking the issue up the chain of command: “we'll work with those who work with us and work with those and try to get around issues through elevating them, and escalating them” (Example 56). They also acknowledge that while this political manoeuvre that may be of some immediate benefit, it may have unintended negative consequences down the track “you can't do that too often”. This highlights the importance of knowing when to push forward (‘persevering’) and when to let go (‘letting go’ and/or ‘unwinding’).

Example 57 is resonant of many other references to being prepared to make mistakes (both in this chapter and in Chapter 4). It highlights the importance of finding a sense of the ‘right’ next step despite not having certainty about how such a step will play out, and with what consequences, in practice. If you make “a decision that was the wrong decision at that point in time”, “[y]ou go ahead and make another one”. Both ‘unwinding’ and ‘persevering’ are in play here. At one resolution this developer is describing how they let go of mistakes (through ‘unwinding’ which implies ‘letting go’) and at another resolution they are describing how they continue on (through

'persevering'). It appears that, like architectural practice (refer Chapter 4), mistakes are not taken too seriously. They are just markers for a step or a series of steps that resulted in something that does not fit the context, and therefore something needs to change. 'Unwinding' in this way is an integrated part of the process of making another decision. It is an aspect of process as decision-making.

5.3.5.2 Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'unwinding'

The gesture of 'unwinding' can refer to a number things: 'unwinding' by 'letting go' of one's ideas (Example 55); 'unwinding' by 'letting go' of working with a certain person or department (Example 56); and 'unwinding' as an integrated part of moving forward in a different direction. Interestingly, in all of the instances, 'unwinding' implies both 'letting go' of something or unravelling of some kind, and 'persevering' with something else. It appears that 'unwinding' and 'persevering' present more as 'unwinding-persevering' depending on the resolution and perspective being discussed. In any case, 'unwinding-persevering' (or 'persevering-unwinding') is crucial in carrying development processes forward as it represents the decision-making process. Whilst it is true that one may be 'unwinding' a project or organisation to the full extent possible by closing it out, even this implies 'persevering' in some way. One will continue on either other projects, in another field or perhaps in leisure. There is something about 'unwinding' that 'clears a space' for something new. Typically, 'unwinding' is provoked by a sense that the process is not working (recognising a mistake, for example) and needs to change in some way. It implies prior gestures of a 'metaprocess of problem-solving' (i.e. 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving') to 'get a handle on' whether to persevere (by 'persevering') or to let go (by 'unwinding' and/or 'letting go').

5.4 GESTURES OF NEGOTIATING IN DEVELOPER PRACTICE

Negotiating plays a central role in developer practice. The three gestures of 'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' play significant roles in developer understandings of how to bring parties together to realise a project. The evidence for

the presence and importance of these gestures in developer practice is laid out in the following sections.

5.4.1 THE GESTURE OF 'TOGETHERING' AND WORKING CO-CREATIVELY

Togethering
'Togethering' is a gesture of working with others. It is a process of two or more people (sometimes with different professional experience, backgrounds and competing interests) coming together to work on an aspect of a project. 'Togethering' implies 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' interiorly as a means to getting along socially. Given that two or more people are involved, it also implies 'brokering'. 'Togethering' refers to the way developers go about co-creating throughout sociopolitical development processes.

5.4.1.1 **Examples of 'togethering' in property developer practice**

Example 58:

> *I think there is a whole range of interpersonal signals that tell you it's clicking. It is not just a social intercourse. It is not just passing the time of day. There is a little something at a personal level where you genuinely say, "Look, I enjoy working with that person", not just because they are funny or whatever it is. It is because there is something there that is not just in the words that are being spoken, it's not just in the work that is being performed, it is not just in the pride in the outcome, it is actually just a commitment to that team environment at that time. And it is hard – it is not something you can orchestrate or curate but it is something that you recognise when it is happening. And I have often had consultants that you would prefer to use as repeat consultants just for the individuals that are at play because you just know there is a rapport happening here. It is more than just a straight professional get the job done dynamic. It makes the whole project a much more creative and interpersonal outcome.*

Example 59:

> *Yeah, absolutely, and you can always find a spot where you can work together with council, with anyone, with action groups in areas. You can find areas where you can work together, because at the end of the day, everyone's common interest is beneficial to what you are doing. There are always ways, you can't – there are some areas where you can't get through but there'll always be areas around that that you can work together. And as long as you have the – you nurture the right relationships for those people, you'll find those.*

Example 60:

> *So we have all got together, we have all said that what will enhance the value of our land and give us more development potential is putting in infrastructure. The*

> *state government wants infrastructure, the state government wants extra housing. So we can provide a strong solution to all of this, plus we can clean up a lot of* [an old industrial area] *as well. So it is getting alliances together where you got common interests and satisfying identified needs and, I suppose, planning strategy.*

'Togethering' in Example 58 is about 'clicking' socially: where "[t]here is a little something at a personal level where you genuinely say, 'Look, I enjoy working with that person,'…there is something there that is not just in the words that are being spoken, it's not just in the work that is being performed, it is not just in the pride in the outcome, it is actually just a commitment to that team environment at that time". 'Togethering' is a matter of working well together as a team of two or more people. As is characteristic of many of the development processes already discussed, 'togethering' is not something that can be 'curated or orchestrated' but "it is something that you recognise when it is happening" (Example 58). This developer knows when 'togethering' is taking place and this implies they also know when it is not. They believe it to be somehow tied to having 'rapport' – perhaps that includes a kind of mutual respect and complementarity of working styles. Whilst it is not something that cannot be forced, it is certainly felt and this implies that the gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' are also in play.

Example 59 points to 'togethering' across organisational and public/private boundaries. Here, however, some of the characteristics of 'togethering' are political. This developer suggests that it is possible to construct an environment of 'togethering': "You can find areas where you can work together, because at the end of the day, everyone's common interest is beneficial to what you are doing". There is an attitude evident in this Example that working together is both possible and potentially mutually beneficial. 'Togethering' implies 'letting go' in the way that one must let go of the autonomy (and perhaps simplicity) that working in a less social environment implies. The other interiorly-oriented gestures of 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' follow as one engages socially and comes to understand others' perspectives and ideas. Finding a way forward via 'togethering' is about finding common interests and working to meet each other's

needs: “everyone's common interest is beneficial to what you are doing”. ‘Persevering’ is also evident here: “there are some areas where you can't get through but there'll always be areas around that that you can work together” (Example 59). Running through this Example is a leaning toward working together – that is, working well with others as a way to realise a project. There is some importance given to ‘nurturing the right relationships for those people’ which demonstrates an appreciation of heterogeneity. This sense of ‘right relationship’ may be referring to the socially-oriented ‘clicking’ described in Example 58, but it could also be referring to a less sincere and perhaps more political manoeuvre resonant of power playing and keeping the right people on side in order to realise one’s own agenda. While ‘togethering’ is suggestive of working together toward a mutually beneficial outcome, it does not by definition exclude power playing or manipulation that results in less than ideal consequences. It speaks more to the active pursuit of one’s interests in a way that is perceived to speak directly to the interests of others, than it does to sincerity.

Example 60 illustrates another instance of ‘togethering’ across organisational and public-private boundaries. This case, however, is specifically about drawing together those with common interests (i.e. adjacent land owners) and lobbying government for additional infrastructure. This is not dissimilar from the way a community action group operates by leveraging the commonalities between individuals to lobby for a cause or some kind of social change. ‘Togethering’ here is the process of coming together to lobby a certain outcome. There is a relationship between the landowners that implies ‘letting go’, ‘connecting’, ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’ as a way to bond socially with others. They are ‘togethering’, that is, acting together for some form of social (and in this case financially beneficial) change. ‘Togethering’ is a way to build relationships that may be beneficial beyond the current and most pertinent objective.

5.4.1.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of ‘togethering’**

The gesture of ‘togethering’ offers a way to foreground more of what one may have in common with others (as in finding common interests) and being able to work together

towards something of mutual benefit. It is more than just being able to speak to the interests of others – it is about being able to find enough common ground to provoke working together towards an objective which is potentially mutually beneficial. It implies finding a way forward together, and implies a shared appreciation or empathetic engagement gained through gestures such as 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving', and perhaps also 'immersing' and 'imagining'. 'Togethering' points to a heightened sensitivity to the intricacies of working well (and often closely) with others. It points to being aware of relational dynamics and the needs (and expectations) of others. It does not, however, exclude the potential for hidden agendas, manipulation and corruption on the presumption that those employing such tactics still intend on meeting the needs of others in some way.

5.4.2 THE GESTURE OF 'BROKERING' RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Brokering
'Brokering' is a gesture of drawing together whatever resources are needed in order to design and deliver an 'image' in built product. Developers rely on 'brokering' as a means to trade or transact successfully with others. Like 'committing', 'brokering' is about promising to do something in return for something else. 'Brokering' is about everyday transacting with others that carries development projects towards completion but does not necessary involve a milestone such as a legally binding contract. 'Immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' (and the finer grained interiorly-oriented gestures) are implied in 'brokering' as one seeks to find a way to meet one's own needs and expectations, and those of others. 'Brokering' spans much entrepreneurial activity and in the case of developers involves attempting to meet the needs of key stakeholders. The way developer's broker deals is in many cases, although not always, directly tied to an anticipated return on investment. 'Brokering' may not translate to an explicit agreement between two parties to exchange something but rather presents as a longer term process of give and take which sometimes translates to what may look like only giving or only taking in the shorter term, but the exchange value is generally intended to even out over time.

5.4.2.1 **Examples of 'brokering' in property developer practice**

Example 61:

> *You must always listen to other people… Well, you've got to form your own view, but I think if you do that in absolute isolation from your marketplace, you may find that you're separated from your money quite quickly. I think you always* [need to] *be very mindful about what the market wants, or what your perception of the market wants. And sometimes the market isn't quite there yet, and you do see other things where you've got a sensational idea and you bring it to market,*

> *but the market isn't there yet. It might be there in five years' time, but it hasn't got there. It hasn't matured. It hasn't changed. It hasn't seen the need for it.*

Example 62:

> *…I'd rather the quality over the return. Obviously not being silly about it, but if you take a short term approach – if we were a short term player, and we were going to do one development, you may have a different attitude. But the fact is we won't compromise brand, I don't compromise brand. To me brand is everything. And success is measured by – one of the measures of success is the amount of people that return back to buy your product, or our product. And or the word of mouth that spreads as a result of the experience they've had with us, hopefully positive. I think you're cutting your nose off to spite your face where you're making a decision that is dollar-driven, because I think by and large that will always come back to bite you.*

Example 63:

> *External factors always influence a project – be it political, be it financial, be it sovereign and be they IR* [industrial relations], *whatever it might be – so there's a number of safety... They're all very important factors and each of those has variables within variables. You can't plan for every single one of them but what you can do is have a framework which allows you to deal with every one of them. The first step is to actually make sure that you have a framework in place that deals with every single one of those issues and then making sure you've got the right people in key decision-making positions that can actually react to issues that may arise at any point in time. Some of them are just common sense and some of them are… you have to draw a long bow to get there, so, I'm not sure that answers the question. Every day is an issue, you know, every day.*

Example 61 is an illustration of 'brokering' a position in the property market which is primarily about finding a buyer for one's built product because: "if you do [development] in absolute isolation from your marketplace, you may find that you're separated from your money quite quickly". 'Brokering' here is the process of finding integration between a design and the market which also implies 'testing' of some kind, perhaps 'testing' by 'immersing' in and 'listening' and 'receiving' feedback from the market, as a way to gauge what people want. Being mindful of market demand is of utmost importance to developer success. If one is not 'listening' carefully to and 'receiving' from the market, then, one is not well placed to design and deliver a saleable product, and the risk of failure increases.

Example 61 also illustrates constraints on innovation within development processes. One can have "a sensational idea and you bring it to market, but the market isn't there yet…it hasn't got there. It hasn't matured. It hasn't changed. It hasn't seen the need for it" (Example 61). Having missed the mark due to innovative practice once or twice and as a result suffered significant losses in the past, one would be very unlikely to attempt radical design innovations before the market demands it. That brings up some interesting challenges for improving the quality of built form. Developers are always speculating in the way that their projects are always new and unique – new site, new design, perhaps some new materials etc. More often they do not have direct contact with potential purchasers, and so are left to anticipate their needs and wants through third party market statistics, population forecasts and infrastructure plans etc., and gestures such as 'immersing' and 'imagining' which provoke empathetic engagement with potential buyers. Skilful developers tend to be conservative when it comes to speculating about market demand, including design innovation, so as not to place themselves and their organisations at undue risk.

Example 62 illustrates the attitude of a developer interested in staying in business in the long term. 'Brokering' here (like Example 61) is also about negotiating a position in a market but not just for one project, rather as part of building a longer term relationship with customers who may buy more than one property. In this instance, 'brokering' is more like attempting to build relationships with customers as a means to fuelling a sales revenue pipeline, and this is presumably tied to meeting expectations in terms of quality. In effect, the developer promises to deliver a certain quality product and in return brokers their way toward loyalty and future business directly or by referral. It is therefore more about delivering on quality as a means to building a brand and increasing the likelihood of future revenue, rather than anything else. To them "brand is everything" (Example 62) and this means meeting customer expectations. The phrase: "I think you're cutting your nose off to spite your face where you're making a decision that is dollar-driven, because I think by and large that will always come back to bite you" has some interesting implications for those with a longer term business interest. It

appears that at least in some organisations, such as this, quality assurance is in some way tied to the design and delivery processes and the branding strategy.

It makes sense that larger development organisations with a longer term business strategy would be attentive to delivering on promises of quality. Conversely it makes sense that those with less at stake, such as lower profile and smaller developers, may not pay quite as much attention to the quality of product they deliver. If that logic does largely hold true, then 'brokering' with those with higher profiles and longer term interests is more likely to bode well for purchasers and perhaps also planning authorities than 'brokering' with those who have lower profiles and/or shorter term interests. Delivering on promises is of course fundamental to 'brokering' a position in the marketplace, not just for a project but for any organisation over the longer term as it effects branding, reputation and market price. 'Brokering' in this case implies 'immersing' and 'imagining' oneself in the shoes of those participating in the market, 'listening' to and 'receiving' from customers (perhaps directly), and also 'imagining' and 'testing' by placing oneself in the shoes of the purchaser inside the imagined built space as part of the design process.

Example 63 shows how 'brokering' is relied upon to navigate everyday opportunities and constraints. This developer knows that they cannot know when or what kinds of issues will arise but they can "have a framework which allows you to deal with every one of them". The framework referred to here is a way to deal with issues which arise unexpectedly. Having a framework implies knowing how to deal with each of the issues. It is as if this developer creates a unique framework to resolve each of the issues as they arise, and places faith in those who work for them that they will do the same (presumably within their delegated authority): "The first step is to actually make sure that you have a framework in place that deals with every single one of those issues and then making sure you've got the right people in key decision-making positions that can actually react to issues that may arise at any point in time" (Example 63). 'Brokering' in this way is a form of problem-solving which implies recognising the problem and finding a way to symbolically represent a framework to address such a problem. It involves

'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening and 'receiving', and 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' as processes to first recognise and then address issues that arise. This is resonant of Gendlin's description of problem-solving:

> *If we see a problem, we must have surveyed something complex enough to present a problem back to us. During the very first moments while we attack a problem, we must have in mind a great many more meanings than we symbolize explicitly in words… Problem solving does not occur until we can name the meaning of the one sentence "that" and, holding "that" in mind, are able to turn to other aspects of the problem to see how they relate to "that". This relating of aspects is one function of felt meaning in problem solving.* (1997a, p. 73)

'Brokering' relies, in this case, on knowing the problem, knowing how it may be addressed and in being able to communicate that effectively to others. It is a process of knowing, communicating and agreeing socially how to resolve issues. The agreement may come by way of the authority of the person who delivers the problem-solving framework, or it may be agreed explicitly between those involved.

5.4.2.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'brokering'**

Developers rely on 'brokering' throughout the development process in order to deliver built product that meets the needs of a market and therefore provides them with a return. 'Brokering' is about making one's way through various issues which arise and arriving at the completion of a project, having met the needs of the market and various other stakeholders involved (financiers, for example). It is a process of responding to changing circumstances in a way that takes one closer to realisation and can take many forms such as finding a position in the market, negotiating sales and building relationships with purchasers and solving problems as a team. 'Brokering' is a movement toward realisation or agreement of some kind, and so also implies 'persevering'.

5.4.3 THE GESTURE OF 'COMMITTING' IMPLICITLY OR EXPLICITLY

Committing
The gesture of 'committing' is a process of agreeing (either implicitly or explicitly) to something. Property developers are 'committing' throughout development processes implicitly by allowing the project to take a specific direction (given they are in many ways an authority on their own private projects), and explicitly by engaging certain specialists, acquiring sites, executing financial agreements and preparing sales and/or leasing contracts etc. Developers commit skilfully and with a sense of integration between the felt sense and their 'image' of what might work in the project context. They also commit unwisely, reactively and with little sensitivity to the risks and potential return of their actions. The 'committing' referred to here is that which is done skilfully and with a felt appreciation of fit. It is an iterative and evolving process of agreeing to proceed which is at play in different ways from inception to completion.

5.4.3.1 **Examples of 'committing' in property developer practice**

Example 64:

> *That's 618 units plus another 200, so it will be 818, plus a contract for student accommodation for the church. I literally drove past it, didn't even go in and I thought that we've got to get this one, and we did. Same as Hurstville this could be car yard and the guy* [inaudible]. *Again, I drove down, never got out of the car – oh I did, I had a bit of a walk around – and I said, "We've got to buy this site" and we did. But then before we did, they'd done a huge amount of in depth study.*

Example 65:

> *…one of the components when you choose sites in specific locations is also to have a certain – you might call it foresight or you might call it appetite for risk to make a commitment… I think it's an instinct. I think it sort of develops over the years and it's also – some people have that instinct and some people are very competent, but they can't take risks. So it has to be a combination of having to be a certain risk taker. You've got to have an appetite to take risks. And it's also handy if you have a bit of an instinctive feeling for specific sites and for specific locations.*

Example 66:

> *But where you get to an agreement with somebody, and you can make a transaction happen, that's probably the high point. After that, you start to get into all the technicalities and the normal process. When you're negotiating voluntary planning agreements with Councils to the extent where you can put in community infrastructure in exchange for floor space, that type of arrangement, when you reach agreement on it, it is very fulfilling.*

‘Committing’ in this instance is the process of agreeing to purchase a site. The precise moment of ‘committing’ is not clear. It could be the decision to commit, evident with "We've got to buy this site" (Example 64) but it could also be the signing of the purchase contract which took place later. Perhaps ‘committing’ was also evident in the earlier decision to visit the site. This seems to indicate that ‘committing’ is not just one point or a series of points but rather a process. It is more like a series of steps leading up to a milestone such as represented in this case by a legally binding contract. From this process perspective, ‘committing’ is incremental and culminates in something tangible and impactful. The developer is putting their money where their mouth is, so to speak, and backing their sense that there is an opportunity for them to do something with this site. ‘Committing’ is sealed to an extent with a legally binding contract which has significant implications (even if the property is not settled). They are in fact free to walk away without much penalty until they are contractually bound through offer-acceptance. The pinnacle of ‘committing’ in this Example is the execution of a contract which is implied by “… and we did” (Example 64). ‘Committing’ in this way results in a milestone such as the acquisition of a site but is not just that, as it includes the process leading up to the pinnacle. It implies various additional gestures of ‘letting go’, ‘connecting’, ‘listening’ and ‘receiving’, and also some form of ‘immersing’, ‘imagining’ and ‘testing’ which all assist in a sense knowing that this is the ‘right’ way forward.

What is described here (Example 65) is very resonant of Example 64 in the way that it draws attention to site acquisitions as a way of ‘committing’. This developer’s appreciation of what that means in practice is illuminating. ‘Committing’ in this instance is about taking a risk based on ‘foresight’ and ‘instinct’ which is somehow grounded in years of experience. ‘Committing’ is somehow tied up with their professional knowledge and a sense of knowing that comes from interiorly considering the site in relation to what they already know about the area and development potential. This is resonant of Gendlin’s (1996) description of ‘resonating a handle’ but it is more inclusive in a way, because this developer explicitly acknowledges reliance on experience and professional knowledge. ‘Letting go’, ‘listening’, ‘connecting’ and ’receiving’, and ‘immersing’, ‘imagining’ and ‘testing’ are implied as means to ‘foresight’ and being able to see an

opportunity. 'Committing' in this case is a process of carrying the development forward by integrating the felt sense of the context with one's 'image' of what might work. Risk is considered a part of the landscape and is mitigated by finding a sense of integration between what one knows of the site (and through experience on other projects, that is, context) and what one thinks is possible.

Example 66 is a reflection of 'committing' as a process of making transactions happen. This developer recognises this as a predominantly social process which is followed by 'technicalities'. 'Committing' in this instance draws attention to the social and interactive character of coming to agreement. What is perhaps most interesting is the sense of satisfaction that comes with 'committing': "when you reach agreement on it, it is very fulfilling" (Example 66). For this developer, fulfilment indicates a sense of integration or synchronicity which comes from finding agreement with another. 'Committing' here refers to the process leading up to and including an exchange or transaction of sorts. Perhaps it only becomes 'committing' once one has reached agreement and there is some kind of reciprocity or exchange; perhaps it is a much longer process which can only be retrospectively understood as 'committing'. Either way, Example 65 is an illustration of 'committing' as a more socially-oriented gesture than the other two Examples here. It is a process which culminates or comes to a head at the point of agreement between two or more parties and which results in some kind of reciprocity or exchange.

5.4.3.2 **Concluding remarks on the gesture of 'committing'**

The gesture of 'committing' refers to a process which culminates in some kind of agreement between two or more parties. It is a socially-oriented gesture which enables development processes to be carried forward – contracts to be executed, development applications to be submitted and so on. Perhaps in that way 'committing' can only be understood in hindsight and only if or as one comes to an agreement of some kind. Or perhaps one is 'committing' so long as one intends such a process to culminate in

agreement and only begins to be otherwise (a gesture of 'unwinding' or 'decommitting', for example) at the point one decides to withdraw from the process.

Developers rely on the gesture of 'committing' throughout development processes. 'Committing', like 'persevering' and 'unwinding', is a continuum where one continues to resolve whether to keep heading towards commitment in the form of some kind of milestone. It implies 'brokering' in the way that one brokers or negotiates in order to come to 'committing'. Pinnacles of 'committing' imply explicit agreement between the parties, but perhaps that is not always necessary. Perhaps 'committing' can be something less obviously transactional, such as the submission of a development application which implies 'committing' by the developer to a particular scheme but does not imply reciprocity of the same kind by the planning authority, except perhaps that they will assess it. 'Committing' by the planning authority does come, however, but at a later date and is implied with the determination i.e. approval or rejection.

5.5 PRESENTING A PARTIAL MODEL OF DEVELOPER PRACTICE

5.5.1 TRANSITIONING BETWEEN GESTURES IN PRACTICE

An in depth understanding the property market, as well as other areas such as finance and construction, is generally considered critically important to property developers and for good reason. From inception and site acquisitions to realisation of built product commercially-minded developers rely on their knowledge of various property and financial sub-markets to remain viable and in business. They rely on their sense or best guess of what people (sellers and buyers) want now and in the future, and who might provide funds for particular aspects of a project and at what cost in order to secure development opportunities, deliver built product and turn a profit. As this veteran developer puts it:

> *…at the end of the day, property is a servant to its community. It's a servant to the economy. We're only sitting in this office because it provides shelter. If we were sitting outside, we'd be bloody wet right now. So, we need a roof. We need all the things that we have. So, you must respect what people are looking for,*

> *what they're prepared to pay, how they're prepared to pay, what they want, etcetera. That goes right across the board. Sometimes you can innovate. You can create a new form of product. Often, you do so kind of at your peril because you think, "What about if they don't want that?"* (Example 67)

In this Example, the gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining and 'testing' are evident. 'Immersing' is foregrounded with references such as "you must respect what people are looking for, what they're prepared to pay, how they're prepared to pay, what they want etcetera" (Example 67). 'Immersing' here is about learning what people want from the market and what has already been done. This becomes particularly interesting when one then considers the role of 'imagining' in this practitioners process. It appears from the quotation, that 'imagining' and creating new and interesting ways of doing things is of fairly little interest. There is a vast difference between asking the question 'what is market currently buying?' versus 'what could we provide to meet the needs of the purchasers that perhaps has not already been done/tested?'. The latter brings in a lot more reliance on the gesture of 'imagining' much like the Examples discussed in Chapter 4 referencing a process of putting oneself in the shoes of inhabitants. In this Example, however, there is a lot less space made for the gesture of 'imagining': "Sometimes you can innovate. You can create a new form of product. Often, you do so kind of at your peril because you think, "What about if they don't want that?" (Example 67). Radical innovation is seen as risky; they would rather respond to the market by delivering what has already been done. Whilst it is true to say that all developments have their own idiosyncrasies and innovations, working from a place of 'immersing' in the market in contrast with 'immersing' in the market and the possibilities offered by new technologies *and* 'imagining' the experiencing of a user is vastly different. [35] Radical innovation and carrying forward of technologies far more likely if space is given to 'imagining' and 'testing' new possibilities. Interestingly, 'testing' is very explicit in this

[35] This is resonant of the contrast between positional and interest-based bargaining. In this Example, the practitioner is looking at the market as a set of positions *rather* than interests which would provide endless opportunities to meet the market. Time and money permitting. In this Example, and specifically with respect to their relationship with the market, this practitioner is functioning like a positional negotiator. They may, however, be more creative with respect to financing.

Example. This is evident in the earlier quote: "you must respect what people are looking for, what they're prepared to pay…" and the recognition that "at the end of the day, property is a servant to its community" (Example 67).

Property development is inherently risky and probabilistic; success depends on many factors including timing, which in this practitioners view is critical:

> *I don't think you can necessarily pare it [success in relation to a project] down to any one thing. You can have the best building in the world, but if you get the market timing wrong, it'll be vacant. That's the way it is. You can design the most beautiful thing known to man, "Wow, look at this." Whether it's [residential] or-- doesn't matter. That timing's important. If you take that out of the equation, you say it's a normal market, I think it's the will to make it as good as you can possibly make it within the dollars that you're allocated to be able to make it. Everything has a budget. At the end of the day, you have price constraints, because you have return hurdles.* (Example 68)

This quotation is predominantly about timing: "You can have the best building in the world, but if you get the market timing wrong, it'll be vacant. That's the way it is" (Example 68). This links to 'immersing' in the way that it points to a kind of astute sensitivity, that is, having a sense of where the market is at in any one period. This practitioner is signaling the challenge and importance of timing, and hinting at their astuteness but the how of what they do in response to this is not clear. The positioning of "best" and "beautiful" as distinct from deliverable points perhaps to a lack of integration in their approach – what they are saying here is that 'imagining' may be largely out of alignment with the market and the primary objective of delivering product. This suggests, based on the new understandings of architectural and developer practice coming out of Chapters 4 and 5, a lack of 'testing'.

If one looks closely again at the above quote, one can see that 'immersing' oneself in the market as a property developer is tied to a purpose – developing a solution which meets the needs of the property market and the needs of the business. 'Testing' is quite obviously fundamental to this person's process in the way that they check the scheme

against their understanding of the market. 'Imagining' has a very confined function here. It needs to deliver within a set of constraints i.e. market and financial, and it appears that this developer is focused on the constraints set by the market and not particularly interested in the opportunities for innovative design. In this Example, the gesture of 'testing' is emphasised and the gesture of 'imagining' is de-emphasised. This is a place where the possibility of enriching business practice arises. Perhaps there is opportunity here to improve the financial returns on development activity through more innovative design than this developer appears to recognise.[36]

As alluded to above, it is substantially easier to remain commercially viable as a developer during a bullish market. Brokering a deal in a softer market – as in the case described below in coming out of a recession – is a much harder task and sometimes success appears to come down to 'luck' more than conscientiousness. In these kinds of circumstances, the more socially-oriented gestures such as 'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' may play a larger role as in the case below:

> *It was 1995. The market was just starting to recover. Everything was kind of on the nose. There'd been no major capital raisings to speak of because we were coming out of the 1990 recession which belted property unmercifully through '91 and through to '93-4. We were just starting to see the market turn. This was just pure opportunism and luck. They [the agent] rang me. God knows why, but they did. I responded. I didn't mess around. I got my partner and we got on a plane and we went down to Melbourne, and we got stuck into it. We figured out that if we were to do this we had to have a capital raising to float [an Australian] Commercial Trust, which was what we did in December '95. We were just about out of money that we'd allocated. I'd allocated some money that-- I wasn't mortgaging the house because I'd already done that in a prior life and that was all paid off, and all that stuff -- but I'd allocated money to start this business. If I didn't start it, I'd go do something else. And within a few months of running out of cash flow it came together, and we had the biggest capital raising of anything in Australia in 1995. $227 million against an asset of $252 million. And that floated and got the business going. Off the back of that other things started to happen...* (Example 69)

[36] This is likely to be more realistic at the upper-end of the market where premiums are often placed on high quality and/or stand out architectural design work.

One can see how ‘brokering’ within a risky financial situation is strongly at play here: “This was just pure opportunism and luck. They [the agent] rang me. God knows why, but they did. I responded. I didn't mess around. I got my partner and we got on a plane and we went down to Melbourne, and we got stuck into it” (Example 69). ‘Togethering’ is implied in the ability to attract funds from a number of investors: “within a few months of running out of cash flow it came together, and we had the biggest capital raising of anything in Australia in 1995” (Example 69). This is not a strong ‘togethering’ in a sense of working together across disciplinary and organisational boundaries as is anticipated in the definition of the gesture but rather ‘togethering’ in a way that the asset on offer and the way it was communicated was successful in attracting the much needed support of other in the form of capital investment in a commercial property trust. Perhaps surprisingly, this developer is relatively uncommitted at this point of the project. ‘Committing’ exists in taking a closer look at the opportunity but in relation to the actual project of attracting enough investment to float on the stock exchange is tentative and subject to attracting enough investment: “We were just about out of the money that we'd allocated… I'd allocated money to start this business. If I didn't start it, I'd go do something else” (Example 69). The ‘committing’ here is realised once the opportunity is proven to be viable.

The more interiorly-oriented gestures of ‘immersing’, ‘imagining’ and ‘testing’ are also present to varying degrees. ‘Immersing’ in this Example is illustrated in the developer’s immediate response to the agent: “They [the agent] rang me… [and] I responded. I didn't mess around. I got my partner and we got on a plane” (Example 69). As with the earlier examples in this section, ‘imagining’ does not get much air time here. It appears that this is an illustration of an opportunistic play, i.e. grabbing an opportunity when one shows up, as opposed to the creation of an opportunity largely of one’s own doing. ‘Testing’ is evident in putting the offer to the capital market; it is a way of exploring the opportunity without yet ‘committing’.

There is also, however, a sense that success in this case resulted from a kind of 'right place, right time' set of circumstances and involved luck and opportunism. The kinds of uncertainties highlighted here demonstrate an important aspect of property development practice where one must often rely on one's own inner felt sense of a situation to carry business forward.

5.5.2 GESTURES AND METAPROCESSES OF DESIGNING AND NEGOTIATING

Resonances between architectural and developer practice emerged during the analysis presented in this chapter. Many of the gestures laid out in Chapter 4 were also evident in the developer data. Architects and developers both rely on gestures underpinning the 'metaprocess of designing' of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering and 'unwinding'. Developers primarily rely on these gestures in their task of transforming a plan into built product – that is, in bringing development opportunities to life in concrete form. Developers rely on 'immersing' primarily as a means to understanding the property market, and 'imagining' and 'testing' as ways to refine their offering to the market. 'Persevering' is critical for developers who are the overseers and final decision makers on the direction of private development in many instances. It takes a fair amount of confidence and tolerance for risk to bear the uncertainty and high-risk high-return profile of property development. Both 'persevering' and 'unwinding' and being poised to try another way are also crucial to developer success. The finer grained gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' enable developers to establish a connection with and heed the felt sense which is always evolving in response to changing circumstances. As with architectural practice, developers rely on the 'metaprocess of problem-solving' to provoke insight and find a way forward. The additional gestures of 'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' make up an additional metaprocess, termed here the 'metaprocess of negotiating'. These three gestures highlight the deal making character of developer practice and add another layer to their practice which is about negotiating the flow of resources necessary in order to deliver built product.

Whilst the 'metaprocess of designing' is typically about the making of architectural detail in the form of an 'image' – even for developers – the 'metaprocess of negotiating' is about finding the resources needed to bring that plan to life in built form. Both are integral to private developer practice which spans architectural design and delivery. Perhaps the latter gestures – 'committing', 'brokering' and 'togethering' – are more pertinent to developer rather than architectural practice because of the responsibility of developers in negotiating resource allocation. These three additional gestures provide a conceptual frame for the way developers (and architects at times, to a lesser extent) go about drawing together the resources required to transform a design solution into built form. They often work together with others towards realisation ('togethering'), they broker and negotiate transactions between various players as part of their everyday practice ('brokering'), and they promise to do certain things at various times and often over lengthy periods ('committing'). The gestures of 'committing', 'brokering' and 'togethering' are integral to skilful developer practice and to brokering the realisation of built form. Developers are tasked with attending to much more than creating a design solution, in contrast to the primary task of architects. From inception to practical completion, developers must draw together the resources required in order to bring the design to life as built form. Both architects and developers rely on a dynamic relationship between the felt sense and their 'image' of built product to inform their practice. 'Image' for developers extends beyond design detail and into their social networking capacities as they seek to orchestrate delivery with business nous and entrepreneurship.

TABLE 5.1: SUMMARY OF A PARTIAL MODEL OF SKILFUL PRACTICES

Metaprocesses	**Gestures**	**Contribution**
Metaprocess of problem-solving	'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving'	Reveals aspects of how thinking happens to resolve issues
Metaprocess of designing	'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing'	Reveals aspects of how thinking leads to doing, and how doing takes place
	'persevering' and 'unwinding'	Reveals design *as* a decision-making process
Metaprocess of negotiating	'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing'	Reveals aspects of how thinking leads to doing with emphasis on brokering the flow of resources

The 'metaprocess of negotiating' has some interesting implications for improving the quality of built product. Developers depend heavily on the contributions of others to succeed, including financiers, purchasers, planning regimes, politicians etc., and rely on their sense – gut feel, foresight and/or instinct – as to how to communicate with and get what they need from others. While design is an important aspect of developer practice, developers are predominantly tasked with the challenge of organising the flow of resources. Their role is less about design in the traditional sense of translating an 'image' into plan form, and more about drawing together the resources needed to deliver built form that meets the demands of property markets. Developers, therefore, rely to a greater extent on 'microprocesses of negotiating' and gestures such as 'committing', 'brokering' and 'togethering' which are supportive of entrepreneurship. Though architects are typically more expert in design and developers in negotiation, it is likely that both rely on gestures of designing and negotiating throughout their professional lives.

6: IMPLICATIONS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MODELS OF PRACTICE FOR PUBLIC PLANNING

6.1 INSIGHTS FROM SKILFUL ARCHITECTURAL AND DEVELOPER PRACTICE

Chapters 4 and 5 explored and analysed the interview data on architectural and developer practice, and identified the metaprocesses of problem-solving, designing and negotiating as central to those practices. This chapter is divided into five main sections and moves on to explore the implications and wider significance of these gestures and metaprocesses to public sector urban planning. The first two sections discuss the metaprocesses of designing and negotiating (which are often underpinned by the 'metaprocess of problem-solving'), and what these might mean for public planning practice. Examples from the data are drawn on to illustrate a more synthetic perspective of what the gestures and metaprocesses might imply for public planning practice. The following section elucidates resonances between architectural and developer practice, and the metaprocesses of designing and negotiating, and comments on the significance of returning to the felt sense as a means to creating (i.e. designing and delivering) quality urban form. The final section of this chapter discusses the potential significance of these findings for the relevant discourses in the literatures of communicative planning, urban design, property development practice and architectural design practice.

6.2 IMPLICATIONS OF A METAPROCESS OF DESIGNING FOR PUBLIC PLANNING PRACTICE

Chapter 4 considered the key gestures that shape and inform the design phase of urban development. It identified various microprocesses that architects rely on to carry their work forward and turn ideas into plans and projects that shape urban outcomes. That work established that architects do not simply design architectural plans. They mediate the transition between ideas, plans and projects, often in the service of private sector developers. That is, they design and influence many of the processes that guide that transition and the implications for urban outcomes. Through their work, experienced and effective architects rely on a 'metaprocess of designing' and the underlying gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding'. As they design, and in their practice generally, they also rely specifically on gestures that enable new ideas to emerge from their felt understanding of their circumstances – these include 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' – and the 'metaprocess of problem-solving'. This section of Chapter 6 focuses on what might arise from public sector urban planners being more consistently aware of and sensitive to the 'metaprocess of designing' that emerged from the architectural data. This discussion illuminates the kinds of valuable lessons that skilful architectural design work may hold for public sector urban planning practice, especially in urban plan and policy making but also for planner-developer negotiations.

6.2.1 EXPLORING AND 'LETTING GO' IN URBAN PLAN AND POLICY MAKING

The notion that skilful design relies on microprocesses of 'letting go' emerged from the architectural data. Acceptance of uncertainty, ambiguity and imperfection in the design process, and the fallibility of the designer was implied and/or explicitly discussed in many of the reflections on architectural practice. The design process itself was often referred to as something like an 'exploration of ideas', 'a flow' or 'a continuum' which resulted in a sense of fit (or misfit) which iteratively implied a way forward.

Designing relies on the recognition that one does not know and cannot know the 'right' solution or the ultimate shape of a design in advance of having explored various possibilities and implications. Exploration and eventual commitment to one solution comes by way of an iterative, evolving and dynamic process of proving integration or a sense of fit between the felt sense and 'image'. Architects rely on the gesture of 'letting go' (amongst others) to iteratively step into the unknown and persist in the creation of new design in plan form. For experienced architects, designing is at least in part a matter of continually 'letting go' which implies opening and exploring. These qualities are evident in this Example:

> [Design] *needs to have direction and purpose, but openness and flexibility to not be frightened of divergent thinking. And also I mean I'm of a generation that designs to some degree through drawing. You kind of explore ideas by what is essentially initially an abstract representation which gradually becomes more specific.* (Example 1, Chapter 4)

For the architect quoted above, drawing is crucial to carrying their work forward. They do not know how the process itself will unfold or how the lines on the plan will take shape until those lines have taken shape. The lines themselves come from the practice of exploring design options through drawing. It is as if a line and the interiorly-oriented sense that comes with it implies the next line, which implies the next, and so on. This is resonant of Schön and Wiggins' (1992, p. 68) characterisation of architectural design:

> *… as a kind of experimentation that consists of a reflective 'conversation' with the materials of a design situation. A designer sees, moves and sees again. Working in some visual medium (drawing, in our example) the designer sees what is 'there' in some representation of a site, draws in relation to it, and sees what has been drawn, thereby informing further designing.*

This exploratory attitude has diverse relevances for public sector urban planners involved in plan and policy making, whose work resonates in many ways with design. Urban plan and policy making are inherently creative processes of defining governance frameworks and/or guiding principles for architectural design, development and

ensuing built product. Done well, urban planning and policy making are far more than "manipulative politics, the rational–technical process, top-down command-and-control practices and bureaucratic rule governed behaviour" (Healey 2003, p. 107), and lean well into the realm of the new and the fresh which come with creative practices such as those discussed in this thesis.

Regardless of the extent to which urban planning systems allow for planner discretion and creative intervention, as with architectural design, public planning work is always taking place at the interface between the known ('what is') and the unformed ('what could or should be'). Public sector urban planners shape urban outcomes through governance transformation processes (Healey 2003). This implies that the skill they bring to their practice is in some way tied to their ability to deal with uncertainty and ambiguity. Perhaps then, like architectural design, urban planning and policy making is a matter of iteratively 'letting go' and stepping into the unknown. If this is so, certain aspects of urban planning might then be usefully characterised as an experimental design process of iteratively moving from 'what is' towards 'what could or should be' as proposed by Albrechts (2005, p. 256):

> *Scenarios identify contingent decisions by exploring what places/institutions might do if certain circumstances were to arise; they enable us to reflect on a series of 'what if' stories. Some of the driving forces are fixed in the sense that they are completely outside our control and will play out in any narrative about the future. Therefore, the 'possible futures' must be placed within a specific context (economic, social, cultural, political, and power), place, time and scale regarding specific issues that are of interest and within a particular combination of actors. The context provides the setting for the process, though it also takes form and undergoes change in the course of the process.*

Given apparent synergies between urban planning and policy making, and architectural design, it may not be too much of a leap to suggest that the 'metaprocess of designing', with its underlying gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' which emerged from the architectural data, may also be drawn into aspects

of urban planning. Taking that one step further, perhaps it could offer a way to scaffold urban planners and policy makers who do not have a reasonable grasp on design processes into such an exploratory approach. This would promote the exercise of creativity (and the taking up of discretionary opportunities in public planning practice) in an iterative, evolving and situated appreciation of what might constitute quality urban governance processes such as described by Healey (2003).

6.2.2 PRESENCING AND 'IMAGINING' IN URBAN PLAN AND POLICY MAKING

There are various examples of imaginatively exploring others' experience of being 'present' in built form in the architectural data (refer Chapter 4). This somatosensory practice is recognised by those such as Pallasmaa as integral to skilful design process. In Pallasmaa's view:

> *… architecture is communication directly from the body of the architect directly to the body of the person who encounters the work, perhaps centuries later.* (2013, p. 71)

'Presencing' (a termed used by one of the participants, refer Chapter 4) is in a broad sense a matter of placing oneself in the shoes of another within the proposed design (or 'image') in order to understand how another person might experience aspects of that imagined unbuilt space. This process is crucial to design in general (and in design circles is often referred to as experience design (or XD)) but it is especially important in architectural work, which often demands attention be paid to ways that people with diverse interests will encounter the built space over time. As Pallasmaa concludes:

> *Every touching experience of architecture is multi-sensory; qualities of space, matter and scale are measured equally by the eye, ear, nose, skin, tongue, skeleton and muscle. Architecture strengthens the existential experience, one's sense of being in the world, and this is essentially a strengthened experience of self. Instead of mere vision, or the five classical senses, architecture involves several realms of sensory experience which interact and fuse into each other.* (2013, p. 45)

Skilful architectural design, and skilful urban planning and policy making processes imply a focus on quality place-making. They offer different ways to effect quality urban outcomes that meet the needs of various and often distinct key stakeholders. Presencing is not about creating the perfect design nor public planning solution, but rather about being sensitive to aspects of urban outcomes which are likely to matter to those who will experience the space. For architects, key stakeholders include private property developers, who typically engage architects on a fee for service basis, and property investors who intend to either occupy or lease out the built product once delivered. For public planners, key stakeholders include political leaders and the affected public (defined in various ways including in terms of the community, precinct and/or state). Both architects and public sector planners are obliged to carry out their work in meeting the needs of various key stakeholders under the scrutiny (and at times substantial interference) of others, for example, clients, political representatives and regulatory bodies. For architects employed by private developers, the power of implementation ultimately lies with private developers, and for public sector planners, the power of implementation ultimately lies with politicians. Recognition of this layer of political influence adds complexity to an already complicated and often conflicted process (Healey 1997; Forester 1989).

Notwithstanding the inherently political character of urban development, both architects and public planners may benefit from paying close attention to the ways skilful architects rely on presencing in their work. Presencing, as it is seen in the architectural data (refer Chapter 4), is an aspect of the 'metaprocess of designing' and especially well-represented by the gesture of 'imagining'. Example 18 in Chapter 4 offers a clear illustration of presencing as a means to being sensitive to the experiencing of another in an imagined space.

> *What I say is that you can presence yourself within a situation and you can see it. I don't know how this happens – you can see it. What I do then is that I will work out what we need to go and research. We have that kind of body sense, and we go and research to get as much as we can within the time that we've got – the*

> *knowledge of different opportunities or contexts or issues that we're knowing what the problem is, and knowing what the potential is.* (Example 18, Chapter 4)

Imaginatively placing oneself in the experiencing of another within one's own 'image' of a design, imagined or on plan, is not a way to make direct contact with another's experiencing but rather a way to engage empathetically, and to intuit what they might experience given a particular (imagined) set of circumstances. It is a kind of multisensory 'testing' of what one might feel in a certain design context and allows for architects, and potentially urban planners as well, to anticipate what an aspect of a proposed design might mean to key stakeholders such as purchasers and/or inhabitants. Presencing allows for architects to check the quality of integration or sense of fit (or misfit) between a symbolic representation on plan (i.e. the 'image' in architectural detail) and the felt sense of another. It is a form of what Pallasmaa refers to as 'empathic imagination' (Pallasmaa in Pallasmaa et al. 2014, p. 12):

> *The designer places him/herself in the role of the future dweller, and tests the validity of the ideas through this imaginative exchange of roles and personalities. Thus, the architect is bound to conceive the design essentially for him/herself as the momentary surrogate of the actual occupant. Without usually being aware of it, the designer turns into a silent actor on the imaginary stage of each project.*

As with exploring and the gesture of 'letting go' (discussed earlier in this chapter), presencing and the gesture of 'imagining' implies a kind of synchronicity between the felt sense and one's 'image'. Perhaps presencing is already a useful process in public sector urban planning – this is especially likely in relation to urban planning and policy making which has some obvious resonances with design processes. Perhaps it is a gesture that some urban planners might benefit from embodying. Either way, empathetically 'imagining' oneself in the shoes of different people is likely to be particularly helpful in the early stages of urban planning and policy making when the schema is more open, and different options and scenarios are being tested for fit.

The notion of 'fit for purpose' for a public planner is not the same as it is for an architect. Traditionally architects, especially those working in service to private and commercially-driven developers, have a narrower focus and set of interests to consider than public sector planners. Architects primarily have their eye on the wants and needs of property market participants and those who will inhabit the built space as this is their mandate as a service provider to private developers. Public planners on the other hand primarily have their eye on the wants and needs of the affected public and political leaders.

Regardless of the breadth and depth of their mandated interests, both architects and public planners are likely to find presencing and empathetically 'imagining' themselves in the shoes of others a valuable exercise. By doing so, they are paying close attention to aspects of built form that matter the most to architects (working in service of private developers) and urban planners (working in service to politicians and the public); and to the human experiencing of 'place quality' (as described by Healey 2003). Architects seek to create a particular experience through clever formation of raw materials and natural elements, whilst public planners seek to do the same, albeit ultimately with less control and/or precision, through urban plans and policies.

6.2.3 'TESTING' IN URBAN PLAN AND POLICY MAKING

'Testing' pervades architectural design processes, reflecting the dynamic, iterative and evolving nature of design as one moves from the abstract to finer detail. It offers a way for architects to prove and refine their design through a process of drawing in and checking for fit of one's 'image' (imagined or on plan) against the more sociomaterial technical, legal and commercial aspects of the project context. Placing oneself in the situation of another ('imagining') is a way of 'testing' the experiential quality of the design. But 'testing' extends well beyond presencing and is relied upon more broadly throughout the design process to assess whether what one has imagined is fit for purpose. Such a gesture is resonant of Schön's description of move experiments:

> *Each move is a local experiment that contributes to the global experiment of reframing the problem. Some moves are resisted (the*

> *shapes cannot be made to fit the contours), while others generate new phenomena. As* [an architect] *reflects on the unexpected consequences and implications of their moves, they listen to the situation's back talk, forming new appreciations, which guide* [their] *further moves.* (1987, p. 157)

Whilst public planners do not often document design to the same level of detail as architects, they do rely on an evolving sense of whether what they propose in urban plans, policies or design solutions will fit a particular situation, .and in doing so must take into account various stakeholder interests and technical specifications which will enable or constrain realisation. This taking in of relevant contextual information (which implies 'immersing', and the gestures underlying a 'metaprocess of problem-solving') and 'testing' this against one's 'image' enables architects and public planners to get a feel for whether their proposed solution is on the 'right' track, and in what ways it needs refining. Architects and public sector urban planners often work at different resolutions or levels of involvement, but the kinds of microprocesses they rely on are likely to be similar if what they are doing is designing – that is, creating a symbolic representation of what they think might fit the circumstances.

Regardless of whether they are working at project, precinct or urban scales, architects and public planners are each involved in the shaping of urban space in an exploratory manner. Of course they never know precisely what will come as a consequence of their decisions. Thus, each profession must iteratively assess whether what they are imagining might work is in fact fit for the context and purpose. 'Testing' is a way for architects, and so perhaps also public planners, to extend beyond the experiential and empathetic imagining discussed earlier toward the kind of resolution required for delivery. It is a gesture which pervades architectural design processes and enables one to move from the abstract and conceptual to the concrete, as is illustrated in the following quote:

> [you have an idea and] *then you test it and you test it about performance, or technical things or whatever. But in each case there is not one solution, there are many ways you can do it, and it is the judgement that you bring to what materials*

> *you'll use, "what is the mood of the place?", "what is the quality of the light?"… and it is driven around interests.* (Example 19, Chapter 4)

The idea that the design "is driven around interests" (Example 19, Chapter 4) adds a new dimension to 'testing' that was also evident in the architectural data. It is interesting to note that the interests of both architects and public planners crossover to some degree. Both seek to have their aspirations realised in built form, and to provide for the needs and wants of their respective key stakeholders. Architectural work in service to property developers primarily orients around private interests and property markets, whilst public sector urban planning orients around political inclinations responding to an affected public. Both intend to instantiate 'place quality' (as labelled by Healey 2003) in their own terms. These terms are the stakeholder interests (public and/or private), which are represented symbolically (by words, images or numbers) and iteratively tested for fit against the felt sense, that carry planning and design forward where presencing is a way of 'testing' the experiential quality of the proposed design solution. Broadly considered, urban planning and policy making are design processes in the way that they shape and are shaped by urban outcomes. 'Testing' in its more expansive definition includes things like structural integrity, environmental sustainability and budgetary constraints.

6.2.4 CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF A METAPROCESS OF DESIGNING

Skilful architects working in service to private developers rely on 'testing' as a means to assess the fit of their proposals and are likely to work in an exploratory and experimental manner. Given the synergies and crossover between architectural design and urban planning, public planners working in service to governments are likely to benefit from understanding how skilful architects do what they do. The kind of practices (gestures) uncovered in this thesis offer a way to iteratively check for integration between one's 'image' of what might work and the felt sense, as opposed to proceeding to the next step without checking carefully for fit. 'Testing' implies 'immersing' and 'imagining',

'persevering' and 'unwinding', and the underlying gestures of problem-solving ('letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving'). Framing design as a process of 'testing' in some ways implies 'letting go', exploring, and presencing ('imagining'). Practitioners who rely on 'testing' as a means to carry their work forward are likely to incorporate many of the gestures of a 'metaprocess of designing' into their practice, and to iteratively reflect on the quality of integration between 'what is' and 'what could or should be', thereby remaining open to an evolving felt sense which offers new and fresh insights.

6.3 IMPLICATIONS OF A METAPROCESS OF NEGOTIATING FOR PUBLIC PLANNING PRACTICE

Chapter 5 uncovered key gestures that shape negotiation processes from the perspective of experienced and/or high profile private developers. It found that private developers rely on various microprocesses in brokering deals which enable architectural plans to be realised in built product. Private property developers often lead project-specific design and delivery processes, take the majority of responsibility for risk and return, and are ultimately responsible for the delivery of built form. Whilst architects do much of the design work, private developers play a significant role in urban transformation processes and realisation of built product that suits private interests. Unlike architects, whose primary focus is on creating an 'image' (or symbolic representation) on plan, developers primarily focus on negotiating the flow of resources necessary for delivery and this is primarily (although not entirely) a social activity. Built products themselves are symbolic representations of what developers and their various consultants believe participants in property markets want. From one perspective, built form arises from private developers negotiating a kind of integration or fit between an 'image' on plan, and a dynamic and evolving set of economic, environmental, social and political constraints, including those shaped by public planning practice. The shaping of built space driven by private development processes is not necessarily about striving for

win-win agreements, but is more often to do with working to ensure one's interests are served, giving consideration to others when necessary to carry the process forward:

> *Building design is continuously shaped through a series of complex negotiations between real estate actors, in the context of wider technical, legal and commercial constraints, as they each attempt to extract value from development activity. The design specification represents the material outcome of this process. However, not all viewpoints will necessarily be represented in the development proposal. Depending upon market conditions, some real estate actors will have more power to influence the process than others.* (Guy in Guy and Henneberry 2002, p. 259)

Like any other commercial enterprise, private developers operate in markets. To do this skilfully, they rely on both a 'metaprocess of designing' and a 'metaprocess of negotiating' (and the often embedded 'metaprocess of problem-solving'). Experienced developers involve themselves in design decisions in designerly ways. They are also skilful negotiators. This resonance between architectural and developer practice emerged from analysis in Chapters 4 and 5, and is discussed later in this chapter. This section, however, principally focuses on what public planners might learn from the ways private developers broker the realisation of built form through the 'metaprocess of negotiating' and the underlying gestures of 'committing', 'brokering' and 'togethering'. The focus here is on the ways developers interact (that is, communicate, dialogue and debate) and come to agreement socially at a fine resolution in order to carry their work forward. Understanding skilful developer practice in this way speaks to the concerns of communicative planners with an interest in democratic planning processes of deliberation and mediation (Forester 1989) because it shines light on how aspects of private practice significantly influence property development and urban outcomes. It also speaks to the interests of the property development literature in uncovering the heterogeneity of developers (Coiacetto 2000; Henneberry and Parris 2013). As Coaicetto remarks:

> *In order to shape urban development, planners have to influence the actions of the players who actually build cities. This requires a sound*

> *understanding of the perspectives, actions and strategies of those builders.* (2000, p. 353)

6.3.1 NEGOTIATING URBAN OUTCOMES VIA THE FELT SENSE

Property developers take significant risks throughout private design and delivery processes. From project inception to completion, developers step into the unknown, the uncertain and the ambiguous. Like architects and public planners, they work with understandings of 'what is' (situational dynamics) and 'what could or should be' (the realised built product) to carry their work forward. In situations where analytical or technical specifications are scarce, such as in the early stages of a project, developers rely more on felt understanding ('foresight', 'instinct', 'gut feel' etc.) to project into the future. That is, they rely on an iterative and evolving combination of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' to generate insight (refer to the section on of the gestures of problem-solving – Chapter 5 section 5.2). Example 62 points to such phenomena:

> *…one of the components when you choose sites in specific locations is also to have a certain – you might call it foresight or you might call it appetite for risk to make a commitment… I think it's an instinct. I think it sort of develops over the years and it's also – some people have that instinct and some people are very competent, but they can't take risks. So it has to be a combination of having to be a certain risk taker. You've got to have an appetite to take risks. And it's also handy if you have a bit of an instinctive feeling for specific sites and for specific locations.* (Example 62, Chapter 5)

Developer practice, in this way, orients from having a sense of what the future could, or should, hold. As well as an appetite for risk, developers rely on an ability to foresee what is possible given a complex set of environmental, economic, social and political forces. Developer practice is about speculating what the market wants, or will, or could be persuaded to want at a specified time in the future and taking a risk in delivering on that. The more precision with which one can anticipate property market dynamics and other structural forces that may affect delivery – such as construction costs, political sensitivities, access to project financing – the more likely one is to succeed in commercial

terms.[37] The 'metaprocess of problem-solving' and the underlying gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' are important to being able to anticipate situations or outcomes that take one closer to the delivery of urban form.

Public planners, like private developers, are focused on satisfying particular sets of interests. Whilst developers give primacy to private interests and property market dynamics, public urban planners give primacy to the affected public, which can be defined in various and divergent ways – broadly as the common good, and more narrowly in terms of marginalised community members and their political representatives, for example. Private interests expressed through property market dynamics vary greatly and are particularly location- and time-sensitive, as well as affected by economic, political, social and environmental circumstances.

A 'metaprocess of problem-solving' and the foresight this provokes plays a critical role in developer practice as a means to anticipating future possibilities and taking advantage of market opportunities. For public sector urban planners working to anticipate the future needs of community members, gestures such as 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' are likely to play an equally important role, as Forester alludes to in his discussions on listening:

> *In planning practice, fact and feeling, reason and emotion are often tightly intertwined. Whether a long time neighbourhood resident faces unwelcome change or a developer financial risk, anger and fear are always close at hand … Planners must not only be able to hear words; they must also be able to listen to others carefully and critically. Such careful listening requires sensitivity, self-possession and judgement. This is a critical part of paying attention – to other people and to substantive issues.* (1989, p. 107)

[37] Social justice and equity are traditional concerns of urban planning. Whilst this thesis has sought to advance the democratic process agenda of communicative planning, the emphasis on property market dynamics here does imply a rather neo-liberal political context which could be met with further research addressing questions such as: (i) how do these gestures fit with the values of social justice and equity?; (ii) how do architects and developers deal with power and conflict?; (iii) what is the role of governments, citizens and courts in the realisation of quality and socially just built form?; (iv) how do architects and developers deal with power and conflict?; and (v) what 'gestures' are useful in this respect and how might they be applied beneficially to the process?

Anticipating outcomes, whether social, economic, political or environmental, and what certain scenarios will or will not deliver is an important part of public planning practice. Like private developers, public planners are interested in seeing their aspirations realised. They each aspire to shape quality urban outcomes. A critical skill in being able to realise one's aspirations is the ability to pre-empt consequences, not just of one's own practice but also of the practice and tendencies of others. Private developer practice is crucial to the realisation (or not) of planning aspirations, and as such urban planners who can understand and anticipate private developer practice and the likely built consequences through gestures of problem-solving and felt understanding are likely to be well-positioned to recognise and counteract important problems in their early stages.

Gestures such as 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' offer to open up developers and public planners to a kind of multisensory awareness that paves the way for them to put themselves in the shoes of others in certain circumstances, and from there to anticipate probable outcomes. Such skill is likely to be important in any creative practice, but it is especially important when one is involved in a highly-social and complex endeavour such as design and delivery of built product.

6.3.2 TOGETHERING', 'BROKERING' AND 'COMMITTING' TO URBAN OUTCOMES

Private property development as the commercialisation, design and delivery of land and buildings relies on good alignment (or integration) between built product and property markets. In effect, private developers work in service to property markets and the people who will buy or invest in their new built product. Property markets are dynamic and influenced by many social, institutional and place-specific factors (Beauregard 2005). They are not "easily explained by the 'thin' logic of market signals and rate-of-return analysis" (Beauregard 2005, p. 2443) and are more correctly characterised as socially-constructed, comprising:

> *… a web of market actors, such as developers, investors, occupiers and professional intermediaries, whose relations are influenced by the regulatory and policy environment. From this perspective, planners are themselves market actors.* (Henneberry and Parris 2013, p. 227)

Both private developers and public planners shape property markets (Adams and Tiesdell 2010). Perhaps private developers have more to gain (especially financially) than public planners from 'listening' to and 'receiving' from property markets, but the affected public have a lot to lose if community needs are misread by public planners and politicians. Private development activity and resulting urban outcomes are significantly influenced by urban plans, policies and practice, and by political leadership. Public planners play an important role in influencing design outcomes, (re)distributing wealth and making regulatory concessions for those who may otherwise be left living with poor infrastructure and/or built environments. This in turn affects the kinds of development activity permitted and ultimately approved, and the stock on offer to property markets. From this perspective, public planners play a significant role in market dynamics by enabling and/or constraining certain types of built product. Whilst property developers rely significantly on their ability to anticipate property market dynamics, urban planners rely significantly on their ability to foresee the ways developers might exploit their controls and the quality of ensuing built product.

'Togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' as key gestures of a 'metaprocess of negotiating' are relied on by developers to negotiate the flow of resources to enable delivery of built form. Example 61 in Chapter 5 is an illustration of each of these processes and the role they play in market positioning:

> *You must always listen to other people… Well, you've got to form your own view, but I think if you do that in absolute isolation from your marketplace, you may find that you're separated from your money quite quickly. I think you always* [need to] *be very mindful about what the market wants, or what your perception of the market wants. And sometimes the market isn't quite there yet, and you do see other things where you've got a sensational idea and you bring it to market, but the market isn't there yet. It might be there in five years' time, but it hasn't got there. It hasn't matured. It hasn't changed. It hasn't seen the need for it*.

The ways in which developers come to understand property markets and the extent to which they are able to anticipate market changes, is a critical aspect of property development. This skill is to a large extent what makes or breaks private development activity. This foresight (insight or instinct) comes by way of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving', and more broadly 'immersing' oneself in market indicators. 'Togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' in this context refer to the ways developers and others determine and deliver a site-specific design. They do so by sharing information and knowledge about the site and their respective needs, and then 'committing' and working together to bring a fit for purpose design to life. A large part of what these gestures of the 'metaprocess of negotiating', and the gestures of a 'metaprocess of problem-solving' which are often embedded in such gestures, bring to light is to do with working socially and as part of a collective to deliver built form.

Public planners are a part of the social network of urban development, and the 'metaprocess of negotiating' that private developers rely on to broker urban outcomes, at times directly, involves public planning practice. Urban plans and policies and planning controls more broadly play a significant role in the shaping of site-specific design solutions, as do conversations between private developers, their architects, and public planners. 'Togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' are a part of the skilful developer repertoire which enables realisation of built product, primarily in private interest terms, but are perhaps equally relevant to public planners seeking to provoke the design and delivery of public planning aspirations. Public planners whose work is at the intersection between urban planning and property development are likely to benefit from relying on such gestures, which may enable skilful negotiation of the public interest into urban outcomes in conversation with property developers. Additionally public planners who appreciate the primacy given to property market dynamics are more likely to read property market indicators and be in a position to anticipate or if necessary counteract future movements so as to support the instantiation of planning aspirations of social justice and equity. These kinds of skills, which in part point to the gestures of 'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing', and imply 'imagining' oneself in the shoes

of a private developer and provoking insight via the 'metaprocess of problem-solving', are likely to be valuable to any planning system.

6.3.3 CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF A METAPROCESS OF NEGOTIATING

Public planners and private developers both intend to have their respective aspirations realised in urban built form. Traditionally, public planners foreground qualities of social justice and equity and strive to meet community interests (however broadly or narrowly defined). Private developers on the other hand are primarily positioned to meet the needs of participants in property markets. The 'metaprocess of negotiating' and underlying gestures of 'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' offer a window into skilful developer practice which may be of use to public planners working at the intersection of urban planning and property development. The way private developers iteratively 'tap and touch' and come to understand the felt sense (Gendlin 1996) via the 'metaprocess of problem-solving' points to a need for more than just analytical or technical rationality (echoing Schön's 1983 thesis). It points to a practice of knowing where to next which is grounded in felt understanding. This is a way for developers to move from 'what is' to 'what could or should be' in a trajectory from the abstract to concrete form which could be of benefit to public planners with an interest in serving the affected public. Private developers pay close attention to the felt sense as a means to understanding what kind of design will fit a particular context, and rely on 'imagining' and placing themselves in the shoes of others as a means to coming to agreement with others which suits their interests. This is a way of approaching urban development that promotes sensitivity interiorly and to what is happening on the ground sociomaterially. It is an approach evident in the developer data that may provide insight as to how public planners could both anticipate, or counteract when necessary, developer behaviour during the negotiation of urban outcomes, and take advantage of discretionary opportunities for public planners to shape private development processes and improve urban outcomes in the public interest.

6.4 RESONANCE IN ARCHITECTURAL AND DEVELOPER PRACTICE

A core resonance between architectural and developer practice, and the 'metaprocess of designing' and 'metaprocess of negotiating' which emerged from the data is the iterative reliance on the felt sense. It appears that iteratively focusing on the felt sense is critical in thinking about how skilful practice involves knowing when to transition between gestures and how to balance between the broader processes of design and negotiation as a project proceeds. This transitioning between gestures involves leaning toward a sense of integration between the felt sense and one's 'image' of what is possible including one's knowledge and perceptions of the project context. This process of integration is about foregrounding the most important aspects of the project in order to test and ultimately find an alignment of one's plans with one's evolving felt sense. A sense of integration or fit is what fuels the next step.

Skilful private sector architectural and developer practice relies on being able to make enough sense of the current state of a proposal in order to have a guess worth betting on as to what will likely suit as a next step. This predictive capacity comes via sensitivity to the quality of integration between the felt sense of a situation and one's 'image' (or symbolic representation of what might suit). It is, of course, not an absolute knowing or a failsafe way to carry a project forward but rather an ambiguous, unclear and 'fuzzy at the edges' sense of knowing that evolves moment to moment as circumstances shift. Architectural design and delivery processes are themselves evolving, dynamic and tightly interwoven, as is especially visible at a fine resolution. Architects and property developers rely on processes of iteration and 'testing' in order to evaluate progress and form judgements regarding the next step. They are however, just that – judgements about what *might* work and what *might* suit.

In the data, 'letting go, 'listening', 'connecting' and 'receiving' (a 'metaprocess of problem-solving'), 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' (a 'metaprocess of designing'), and 'committing', 'brokering' and 'togethering' (a

'metaprocess of negotiating') are often visible independently, contingent on each other and associated with the idea of travelling into the unknown that pervades practice. As skilful architects and private developers go about transforming ideas into built product, they rely heavily on their own felt sense or experiencing of what might fit a particular situation. Paying careful attention to modes of practice at a fine resolution has not only uncovered a number gestures of designing and negotiating, as well as those finer grained gestures of problem-solving delineated by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999), but has also uncovered some surprising resonances between architectural and developer practice. Although often focused on distinct tasks (design and delivery respectively), architects and private developers appear to work in quite similar ways. Both can be seen as designers and negotiators of urban outcomes, with many of the gestures seen in both sets of data. Their practice is a creative transition from 'what is' to 'what could or should be' which pivots from the felt sense. One can anticipate that an approach of this kind, deploying the gestures discussed and orienting from the interests of the affected public might also be useful in public planning practice.

6.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FINDINGS IN RELATION TO THE LITERATURE

Unlike private architects and property developers, public sector urban planners work predominantly for political leaders and the affected public. It may be easier to assume dissonance between public planning and private development practice and enforce traditional boundaries of conflict than to look for resonance. However, this research with its view of practice at a fine resolution illuminates some interesting possibilities for learning across distinct professional traditions and/or settings. It appears that these findings, of models of problem-solving, designing and negotiating, at least in some instances apply to both architectural and developer practice. Perhaps if one looks closely at public planning practice one might find similar kinds of gestures and metaprocesses in play. Certainly, one can see just by gazing from the outside, that public planning has a number of significant resonances with private architectural and developer practice.

Public urban planning systems, as representatives of the people, lean toward the instantiation of planning aspirations and qualities such as social justice and equity in built form. Architects often work in service to developers who ultimately lean toward integration between design and property markets, which enables the realisation of built product. Architectural design has resonances with policy and plan making in particular. The practice of both shapes, and is shaped by, dynamic urban landscapes (including broader social, economic, environmental and political forces) through symbolic representation of constraints (and opportunities) on plan.

Property developers as the overseers of private development design and delivery processes, are ultimately responsible for sourcing the resources necessary to enable realisation of their product. Public planners working at the interface of public planning and private development, such as development assessment planners, are in some respects responsible for the negotiation of urban outcomes in public interest terms. What exists in planning controls designed by urban planners and policy makers and other expressions of leadership, significantly influences the direction of private development processes. What happens between public planners, politicians and property developers through interpersonal communication, debate, and dialogue during negotiation of project approvals is important. In Forester's words:

> *Analysts must recognize that what gets done depends heavily on what gets said, and how it is said, and to whom. By doing so, they can seize opportunities to counteract a wide range of disabling and distorted claims: exaggerated threats, needlessly obscure and confusing analyses, strategically hidden information, manipulated expectations, and so on. Working in these ways, planning analysts can expose, however subtly and partially, unwarranted exercises of power and the resulting obstacles to citizens' political action. Those analysts can aid citizens' organizing efforts to re-establish legitimate and responsive public policy initiatives.* (1989, p. 23)

The resonances between architectural and developer practice uncovered during analysis and synthesis of the interview data may have some interesting implications for communicative-collaborative-deliberative planning and the broader urban planning

research agenda, which aspires to engender quality, socially just and equitable urban outcomes. Urban planning, architectural design and property development processes are tightly interwoven aspects of urban development and so looking carefully at private architectural and developer practice is also looking carefully at the way architects and developers interact with public planning practice and systems. This section discusses the significance of the findings in relation to each of the bodies of literature introduced in Chapter 2, focusing on the major contributions of this fine grained experientially-oriented inquiry to the communicative planning, urban design, property development and architectural design literatures.

6.5.1 RETURNING TO THE FELT SENSE

The felt sense (Gendlin 1997a; Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) emerged from the data early in the analysis as a well-founded conceptual construct that is useful in understanding professional practice at a very fine resolution. Skilful practitioners heed the felt sense and employ the underlying gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' in much of their work. At a slightly coarser resolution, they also rely on gestures underlying the metaprocesses of designing and negotiating, which they appear to transition between in a quasi-sequential manner in moving from project inception to completion. Openness and sensitivity to the felt sense appears to underpin the design and negotiation of quality urban outcomes. Skilful architects and private developers rely on a dynamic and evolving sense of integration between (i) their felt sense, and (ii) their explicit 'image' of what might suit the project context in carrying their work forward. Both are touchstones for architectural and developer practice which can be characterised as iterative and evolving from the abstract to the concrete. From this perspective, built form is a result of iteratively 'getting a handle on' one's evolving felt sense and one's evolving explicit 'image'.

6.5.2 A RETURN TO THE LITERATURE

The gestures that comprise the metaprocesses of problem-solving, designing and negotiating described in Chapters 4 and 5 have the potential to speak to the communicative planning interests of open dialogue, debate and deliberation. Communicative planners (such as Forester 1989; Healey 1997; Innes 1995) lean towards consensus via democratic processes such as "uncoerced collective criticism, political argument, and dialogue" (Forester 1989, p. 141). According to Forester, in order to create space for conversations, progressive public planners must understand "how existing social and political-economic relations actually operate to distort communications, to obscure issues, to manipulate trust and consent, to twist fact and possibility" (1989, p. 141). Forester (1989, p. 162) calls for critical, argumentative analysis of the 'structural, organisational and interactive' aspects of planning practice to inform "pragmatics with vision [and] to reveal true alternatives, to correct false expectations, to counter cynicism, to foster inquiry, to spread political responsibility, engagement and action" and argues that such practice is "technically skilled and politically sensitive, [and] simultaneously an organizing and democratizing practice" (1989, p. 162).

A critical planning theory such as the one described by Forester (1989) points specifically to the importance of understanding the finer grained character of public planning practice and implies, by close association, that skilful public planners must pay careful attention to the ways their practice affects the practice of others, and the overall organisation of private design and delivery processes. In Forester's words:

> *The role of theory is not to predict "What will happen if . . .", instead, it is to direct the attention of the decision-maker, to suggest what important and significant actors and events and signals to be alerted to, to look for, to take as tips or warnings. Thrown into situations of great complexity, decision-makers need theories to simplify their worlds, to suggest what is most important to attend to and what can safely and decently be neglected.* (1989, p. 64)

Despite Forester's calls (both implied and explicit), so far most of what is talked about in the communicative planning literature (e.g. Innes 1995, 1998a; Healey 1992a, 1992b, 1997) refers to public planning practice, and does not explicitly draw on fine grained analyses of private sector practitioners. This inquiry has, in some way, sought to address this.

In addition, communicative planning theory (including Forester 1989; Healey 1992a; 1992b, 1997) tends to emphasise communicative rationality and does not prioritise the importance of responding creatively to others' needs. If one wishes to foster innovative improvements in the quality of built outcomes, and not simply establish social justice and/or equity in a homogenous or non-diverse manner, one needs to understand how creative practice takes place. A sensible place to start is by looking into the creative practices of private professionals whose focus is on the design and delivery of built product. Indeed, in this case, focusing on private practice means paying close attention to critical planning interests such as the ways transformative processes (in a structural sense), working with uncertainties and travelling between scales unfold somewhere between project phases of inception and completion. Private development practice is from a communicative perspective, with its attention to interactive qualities, a reflection and in some ways a result of public planning processes. Such a view is supported by Forester in his general discussion on the co-constructed character of professional work:

> *Organizational morale and staff motivation are far from trivial issues. Instrumental output and daily working environment both depend on good internal working relations in which staff securities, fears, and suspicions can be eased and where cooperation, pride in one's work, and innovation can be fostered. This is true in public or private settings, in a for-profit firm or a nonprofit agency.* (1989, p. 69)

Whilst Forester (1989), Healey (1997, 2004) and Innes (1995, 1998a) point independently to the potential for a focus on interactive dynamics and creative thinking to contribute to public planning practice and process outcomes, guidance on how to develop creative practice has not emerged in the planning education literature. The findings of this research contribute to this gap in understanding of modes of creative

thinking. By developing a partial model of creative practice, they augment the work of Forester, Healey and Innes by: (i) offering a scaffold for gestures of problem-solving, designing and negotiating through fine resolution analysis; (ii) revealing resonances between architectural and private developer practice, which implies that there may also be resonances in public planning practice worth investigating; and (iii) providing a rich account of architectural and developer practice which may add to public planners' critical appreciation of what goes on in private development processes and how those processes may be self-consciously shaped by planners to deliver more in terms of public interest.

The partial model of practices developed in this thesis emphasises an aspect of creative practice that is often alluded to in communicative planning theory but largely ignored: that is, the nuanced character of creativity close to the experiencing of meaning that has been referred to (following Gendlin 1997a) as the felt sense. The need for careful interiorly-oriented analyses of communicative gestures such as that undertaken in this thesis is alluded to by Healey:

> *Planners do not work in isolation, but interact with others in complex institutional settings (Goldstein 1984). In any conversation among experts these knowledge forms coexist and combine. The participants are actively involved in constructing and filtering understandings and valuings. A full understanding of the impact of what planners do must address their contribution to the interrelated activities of knowing, acting, and valuing (Innes 1989, 31) in interactive situations. This means analyzing communicative acts.* (1992b, p. 9)

Here Healey (1992b) points to the co-constructed creation of meaning, knowing and understanding, and calls for analytical methods that promote sensitivity to understanding and explicating practice at a fine resolution. From the analysis of architectural and developer practice in Chapters 4 and 5, one can see that orienting from the very fine resolution practices discussed by Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) has certain benefits:

(i) the findings (i.e. gestures and metaprocesses) emerged and are presented from an interiorly-oriented perspective of skilful practice, and are intended to be observable and relatable experientially by practitioners and researchers alike;

(ii) as a result, the grounded theory – in the form of a partial model of skilful practices – is open to further testing and expansion through careful analysis of others' experiences of skilfulness in a number of directions, including across disciplinary and sectoral boundaries; and

(iii) the nature of the research, which is grounded in what is likely a universal aspect of experiencing – that is, the felt sense, implies that with careful interiorly-oriented checking through mini thought experiments one may act as a researcher-and-practitioner and observe, understand and build upon such a model by inquiring into one's own practice.

The potential insights for public planners arising from the research are not so much about getting planners to attempt to embody skilful architectural and developer practice per se, but more about showing how attending to certain aspects of their own practice (for example, 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing')) might be beneficial to contributing to quality urban outcomes in public interest terms. An appreciation of skilful private practice might provoke better understanding between architects, developers and public planners and enable some public planners to take up some of skills embodied by the private sector practitioners discussed here in ways that suit their own work settings. In each of the metaprocesses of problem-solving, designing and negotiating there are clear resonances with the inclusive and democratic qualities referred to by Healey (1997) and Forester (1989). 'Letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' as a means to insight; 'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' as a means to making; and 'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' as a means to navigating the social aspects of practice each in their own ways provoke a move towards 'empathic imagination' (Pallasmaa in Pallasmaa et al. 2014). Inherent in these families of gestures

is a kind of being sensitive to the experiencing (real or imagined) of another as a means to meeting their (and one's own) needs.[38]

Rather than addressing 'listening' primarily as a politicised act of listening carefully to marginalised others in power-soaked urban landscapes, there also needs to be increased valorisation in planning practice of 'listening' astutely to the felt sense. As Forester argues:

> *As an expression of concern for serious conversation and dialogue, the listening that planners do may make trusting relationships possible. By offering reciprocity, their listening can work to create a sense of mutuality in place of the suspicions of a vociferous collection of individuals. As they search for possible meanings, for underlying interests, and for key experiences, planners can encourage others' voice, action, and self-understanding* (1989, p. 111).

'Listening' in the way that it emerged from the data takes place from a more interiorly-oriented perspective than discussed by Forester (1989). Where Forester emphasises listening socially (as in listening to others) as a way to gather valuable information, the gesture of 'listening' and the associated gestures of problem-solving described herein emphasise the interiorly-oriented character of co-creating knowing and understanding. The findings of the research suggest that being sensitive to one's bodily processes is important to the skilful performance of architectural and developer practice. A felt sense is always of a situation, and so 'listening' to the felt sense is listening to one's situation. But it is 'listening' through the medium of one's felt sense rendering in contrast with listening with an emphasis on listening socially to dialogue and discourse (including the nonverbal cues of others) as discussed by Forester (1989). What emerged from the analysis draws attention to the character of 'listening' as experiential and situated; a communicative act of listening to oneself and to context at one and the same time.

[38] This is not to imply that *just* using these gestures will lead to fairer and/or more equitable outcomes.

Furthermore, the contrast between the creative and analytical (such as in Pallasmaa 2009, 2013) draws too stark a contrast: there is a quasi-procedural orderliness to practice at a finer resolution, as illustrated in the analysis, and in Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999). The findings from this inquiry open the door to reconsidering this contrast and mapping the landscape of kinds of thinking in these and other practice traditions in a more nuanced way.

If one considers public planning practice alongside architectural and developer practice, one can see a number of resonances. Each aspires toward realisation of their respective interests in built outcomes, publicly or privately oriented, – and each uses symbolic representation as a means to communicate their intent to others along the way. Planning practice is more than the symbolic representations of quality urban outcomes held in planning controls, as is highlighted by Healey:

> *Planning systems consist of formal rules to guide the conduct, the resource allocation and management activities of individuals and businesses. But they are more than a set of rules. The rules derive from conceptions of situations (contexts), problems experienced in these situations, ways of addressing these problems and of changing situations. It is where planning effort is deliberately focused on changing situations that we can speak of a planning with transformative intent.* (1992a, p. 156)

Architects and developers rely on urban planning controls and less formal public planning communications to understand planning aspirations which they then demonstrate in conceptual architectural designs and ultimately, built product. Whilst planning controls are a crucial part of planning practice, they are only a part of it. Another crucial part of planning practice is what happens in the spaces between pen to plan and policy. Public planners, like many other practice traditions, rely on processes of designing, negotiating and problem-solving to deliver outcomes consistent (and compliant) with regulatory controls. These are often referred to as the informal, interactive, discretionary and/or communicative aspects of planning practice (Healey 1998; Gunder 2008).

Based on the research findings, it appears that the fine resolution discretionary and communicative aspects of architectural and developer practice assist them to make decisions about what kind of 'image' might fit a particular context and how that 'image' might be brought to life in plan and built form. The 'image' is effectively communicated through a symbolic representation of the felt sense of a situation. It is quite likely that the same process holds largely true for public planning practice and the creation of urban plans and policies – that is, that public planners rely on similar processes in designing, negotiating and problem-solving in their everyday practice of communicating planning aspirations. Like architectural and developer practice, public planning involves extended, networked, quasi-sequential series of communicative acts. Planning from this communicative perspective draws attention to the importance of understanding practice at the fine resolution of practice, and this study highlights the potential significance of such process oriented analyses. It is in the process of practicing that the problem-solving, making and negotiating happens, and it is from a complex array of the practice gestures and metaprocesses discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 that a significant part of what is realised on the ground is born. The gestures and metaprocesses discussed begin to describe how creative architectural and developer practice happens.

Despite there being much in common between architectural, private developer and public planning practice, there is little in the urban planning literature. Because urban planning, architectural design and delivery processes are so tightly interwoven, looking closely at the interactive quality of public planning practice is likely to illuminate at least some of what is at play in private architectural and developer practice. There is also more to explore regarding the intricacies of private practice in property development (Ball 1998; Gore and Nicholson 1991; Guy and Henneberry 2002; Healey 1991). The nuanced view of architectural and developer practice arising from the fine grained analyses of this research can contribute to understanding architectural and developer modes of practice that are also largely undiscussed, except for those in the architectural literature such as Alexander et al. 1977, Alexander 1979 and Pallasmaa 2009, 2013. Looking at skilful architectural and developer practice alongside one another, and in

relation to public sector urban planning perhaps tends to reinforce existing views about the narrowness of developer interests, but more excitingly it illuminates synergies between architectural and developer practice, which begs the question as to whether such synergies might also exist public planning practice. If so, perhaps something could be done to encourage public planners, architects and developers to work more creatively together and promote potential for cross fertilisation of insights into skilful practice. In the communicative planning frame of debate, dialogue and deliberation could be considered as a starting point. Architects and developers often interact with urban planning in the sense that they respond to the opportunities and constraints set by rules, regulations and negotiated outcomes. From this perspective, looking closely at architectural and developer practice is at least in part looking closely at the ways these kinds of private sector practice are shaped by, and go on to shape, public planning practice. At a minimum, there is wisdom in public planners understanding private sector architectural and developer practice as these two traditions play significant roles in the design and delivery (or not) of planning aspirations. Perhaps there is also wisdom in looking closely at the ways architects and developers approach urban development processes for insight into how planners might also benefit from such gestures. As Schön (1987, p. 39) concludes:

> *If we focus on the kinds of reflection-in-action through which practitioners sometimes make new sense of uncertain, unique or conflicted situations of practice, then we will assume neither that existing professional knowledge fits every case nor that every problem has a right answer. We will see students* [and practitioners] *as having to learn a kind of reflection-in-action that goes beyond statable rules – not only devising new methods of reasoning… but also constructing and testing new categories of understanding, strategies of action, and ways of framing problems.*

6.6 LEVERAGING THE FINDINGS OF THIS INQUIRY

Public planners working alongside developers and architects and with an understanding of the metaprocesses of problem-solving, designing and negotiating may be well

positioned to leverage discretionary opportunities for the realisation of public planning aspirations such as the redistribution of power and wealth, social justice and equity. Those who practice the gestures and metaprocesses of problem-solving, designing and negotiating are likely to pay close attention to context relevant shifts and changes, and use this to inform their next step. Public planners who iteratively pay attention to changes in context and the affects these might have on the realisation of planning aspirations are well positioned to respond to such changes, and to address neglected aspects of built environments (for example, those that are not easily commodified such as affordability, sustainability, aesthetics and accessibility) through urban plans and policies, and/or site-specific specific negotiations with developers. This is important because, as Forester (1989, p. 101) determines, public planners must play an active role in the materialisation of public aspirations:

> *Planners who provide just the facts, or information about procedures, to anyone who asks for them seem to treat everyone equally. Yet where severe inequalities exist, treating the strong and the weak alike ensures only that the strong remain strong and the weak remain weak. The planner who pretends to act as a neutral regulator may sound egalitarian but is nevertheless acting, ironically, to perpetuate and ignore existing inequalities.*

The gestures and metaprocesses delineated in this thesis may offer a way for public planners to leverage the creative aspects of architectural and developer practice, and provoke more sensitive symbolic representation of community interests in built product. The metaprocess of designing may act as a framework for understanding and emulating architectural design opportunities and limitations; the metaprocess of negotiating may act as a framework for understanding and emulating entrepreneurship; and the metaprocess of problem-solving may provide insights that are grounded in the creation of knowing and meaning.

7: CONCLUSION

7.1 RESEARCH PROCESS

This thesis reports on an inquiry into fine grained interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented aspects of skilful architectural and private developer practice. The primary research question, which centred on how skilful architects and private developers do what they do, arose from noticing an absence of attention to the fine resolution and experiential aspects of private development practice within the planning and property development literature. In eliciting and distilling the intricacies of architectural and developer practice from first person perspectives, this research has made a contribution to the literatures of communicative planning theory, urban design focused on creative practice and problem-solving, experientially-oriented architectural design practice and property development practice.

Drawing on semi-structured interviews, the research was founded on first person experientially-oriented accounts of creative practice and problem-solving in private development contexts. This allowed exploration of the intricacies of skilful architectural and private developer practice. The objective was to identify and explicate gestures (Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999), such as those that underpin creativity, problem-solving, designing and negotiating, in ways that others working within and/or adjacent to such practice traditions might find useful. My own professional experience at the interface of planning, design and development in Australia, led me to think that opportunities for improving the sharing of knowledge and leveraging of skilfulness across such disciplines were well worth pursuing.

Building on Gendlin's (1996) work on 'the felt sense' and Petitmengin-Peugeot's (1999) work on 'the intuitive experience', the research design was framed to support a philosophically sophisticated explanation of felt experiencing and the creation of

meaning and knowing at a very fine resolution. The gestures of felt experiencing or intuition, described as the 'metaprocess of problem-solving' (i.e. 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving'), which were identified from the work of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999), were used as a starting point for exploration and analysis of interviews with a group of highly-skilled Australian practitioners. What emerged were gestures underpinning a 'metaprocess of designing' and a 'metaprocess of negotiating'. These were found to be important in architectural and private developer practice at a somewhat coarser resolution than that of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' and to be closely associated with the notion of bringing something into the world, as opposed to feeling experientially.

This inquiry gave primacy to the kinds of gestures skilful architects and private developers rely on during the design and delivery of built product. As outlined in the opening chapter, the research questions were (refer Chapter 1 for more detail):

(i) what kinds of gestures shape skilful architectural and private developer practice at a fine resolution – that is, close to the creation of meaning;
(ii) what kinds of roles does heeding a felt and bodily-oriented sense (Gendlin 1997a) play in such practice traditions, particularly in instances of problem-solving, designing and negotiating;
(iii) how do these gestures (and other insights that emerge from the data) speak to the research interests of the relevant communicative planning, urban design, property development and architectural literatures?

The primary reasons for pursuing this agenda were that (as per Chapter 1):

(i) Public planners (and urban designers), architects and private developers might be able to learn from them (Schön 1983, 1987; Albrechts 2005; Higgins and Morgan 2000) and, thus, be more creative in their practice; and
(ii) Public planners and urban designers in particular might benefit from a more intricate appreciation of private sector design and delivery practice because such

knowledge may illuminate ways to improve the delivery of public planning aspirations.

The accounts of practice contained in the relevant literature were a significant influence in the conceptual, ethical and methodological framing of the research design) and research outcomes. Communicative planning theory and the fine resolution work of Forester (1989), Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997) and Innes (1995, 1998a) were important for a number of reasons: firstly, most notably for setting a conceptual framework of public planning practice as complex, dynamic and interactive; and secondly, because their research lays a foundation for fine grained research in public planning practice which implies that a like inquiry into private sector practice might also be useful in carrying urban development process forward.

A smaller body of research into developer practice by Coacietto (2000, 2001) and Guy and Henneberry (2002), illustrated diversity and complexity in practice and suggested potential for exploration of additional layers of developer and other associated practices in urban development settings. Research on urban design practice, and in particular, creativity and problem-solving, such as those carried out by Albrechts (2005, 2015), Madanipour (1997), Sternberg (2000), and Higgins and Morgan (2000), made the argument for a focus on building such skills in public planning and urban design arenas. Importantly, Albrechts (2005) and Higgins and Morgan (2000) concluded (like Hendricks 2001) that such skills can be taught. The experientially-oriented architectural literature such as work by Pallasmaa (2009, 2013) and Alexander (1979) provided the most resonant explications of professional practice. Despite being quite far removed from the central communicative planning audience, this literature played an integral role in the research by providing careful descriptions of first person and interiorly-oriented skilfulness from a resonant practice tradition (most like the work of Gendlin 1996 and Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999).

This inquiry set out to attend to a number of gaps in the literature, with primacy given to the concerns that might be found from the perspectives of urban planning audiences.

Communicative planning theory has not given much attention to private sector practice of key stakeholders such as architects and developers, despite being influenced by notions of 'communicative rationality' (Habermas 1984) and interest-based bargaining (Fisher and Ury 1999). Those writing on urban design with an interest in creative practice raised the importance of finding ways to provoke creativity and argued that it is teachable, but had not turned to architecture or property development as potential sources of insight. Property development literature attending to the experiential aspects of private developer practice was scarce and architectural practice non-existent, despite various calls for a greater appreciation of what goes on in development processes. Though fine resolution and experientially-oriented examples of research into architectural design practice existed, there was not much discussion of how such practice speaks to the reality that architects often work in service to developers or at the very least are enabled and constrained by social networks within which architectural design is embedded. There is far more in urban development practice that is of a cross-sectoral and cross-disciplinary character, which often goes unrecognised in the associated literature. This inquiry worked across the disciplines of architectural design, property development and urban planning seeking to address that in a specific way.

This inquiry was designed to explore the qualitative aspects of skilful architectural and private developer practice. The data was collected in semi-structured interviews with experienced and often high profile practitioners and analysed in a constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006) fashion with phenomenological sensitivities (Van Manen 1990, 2014; Todres 2007) that resulted in the identification of families of gestures and metaprocesses. The main limitations of the research related to the Australian context, the focus on skilful (rather than usual or average) practice, and the disciplinary and sectoral breadth which extended to private sector architects and developers only.

The constructivist grounded theory framework for analysis (Charmaz 2006) provided the flexibility to modify techniques and sequencing of analytical processes, and to lean on other theoretical orientations. Interview data was analysed at a fine resolution and the

gestures emerged both from the qualitative analysis of patterns in the self-reported processes and also from close comparative reading alongside the very fine resolution and interiorly-oriented process model work of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999). Nicolini's encouragement of methodological diversity and framing of a 'theory-method package' (2012) that emphasises zooming in and zooming out of the data to understands practice was useful and resonant in many ways of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006). Both of these assisted in the stimulation and explication of gestures and metaprocesses.

From the fine grained analysis of skilful architectural practice, empirical evidence emerged to show that architects rely on gestures (and processes and metaprocesses) of problem-solving and designing in order to carry their design work forward. Through the very fine resolution gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' (described as a 'metaprocess of problem-solving') and through the slightly coarser resolution gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding' (described as a 'metaprocess of designing'), skilful architects are iteratively trying to find a sense of integration between what they feel, what they think and what they intend to do (i.e. the 'image' of the design). The next step is always into the unknown but is guided, to varying degrees, by a felt sense of what is fit for purpose. The design process, considered in this way, is a pulsation between fit and misfit, and between gestures of 'persevering' and 'unwinding'. What one can say from this is that skilful designers seem to rely on a sense of knowing interiorly and in relation to the sociomaterial aspects of the world in their decision-making (much like that described by Gendlin 1996 and Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999). Architectural design practice can, therefore, be usefully characterised as a complex and evolving first person and experientially-and-sociomaterially-oriented process of moving iteratively from the abstract to the concrete.

Findings from the fine resolution analysis of private developer practice, on the other hand, offered something different but complementary. In Chapter 5, the findings demonstrated resonances between architectural and private developer practice. Most of the gestures identified and explicated in Chapter 4 were also evident in the developer

interview data. Both architects and private developers rely on gestures which underpin the 'metaprocess of problem-solving' and 'metaprocess of designing'. The key difference, perhaps unsurprisingly, was that where architects rely on such gestures to carry forward their task of design, developers do so in order to carry these designs toward delivery of built product. A number of additional gestures – 'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing' – also emerged from the developer data and these were directly related to processes of negotiation. They are an important addition because they shine light on the highly-social and political deal-making character of developer practice and describe another layer of complexity to urban development practice which speaks to private sector negotiation of the flow of resources that is critical to enabling the realisation of built product. Developer practice is resonant with design practice in the way that it is about finding an 'image' that is fit for purpose in design and commercial terms. Similar pulsations between fit and misfit, and 'persevering' and 'unwinding' were also evident in the developer data. In the case of private developers, however, the focus was broader and the decisions at times riskier and more opportunistic, and as a result were often significantly reliant on a felt sense of knowing what might fit.

7.2 THE FINDINGS IN RELATION TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In response to the first research question: 'What kinds of gestures shape skilful architectural and private developer practice at a fine resolution – that is, close to the creation of meaning?', it is clear from the findings that a number of gestures can be unpacked at a fine resolution. Each gesture is related in some way to a family of gestures (a metaprocess) and takes place within that family in a quasi-sequential manner. The model of skilful practices uncovered in this thesis in the form of gestures and metaprocesses is summarised in the table below, which replicates the findings shown in TABLE 5.1 (p. 243).

Metaprocesses	**Gestures**	**Contribution to practice**
Metaprocess of problem-solving	'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving'	Reveals aspects of how thinking happens to resolve issues
Metaprocess of designing	'immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing'	Reveals aspects of how thinking leads to doing, and how doing takes place
	'persevering' and 'unwinding'	Reveals design *as* a decision-making process
Metaprocess of negotiating	'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing'	Reveals aspects of how thinking leads to doing with emphasis on brokering the flow of resources

The 'metaprocess of problem-solving' is the name given to families of gestures described in the parallel process models of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999). These gestures are seen in the data drawn from skilful architectural and developer practice. The metaprocesses of designing and negotiating offer a new conceptual framework in the form of a microprocess model of skilful practices, and show how these processes, which are often mischaracterised as separate, lead to doing in various ways.

A number of significant conclusions can be drawn from the findings regarding second research question: 'What kinds of roles does heeding a felt and bodily-oriented sense (Gendlin 1997a) play in such practice traditions, particularly in instances of problem-solving, designing and negotiating?'. It emerged from the analysis that the felt sense plays a critical role in creative practice and processes of problem-solving, designing and negotiating. It was also clear from the processes of data collection and analysis that whilst the felt sense as an interiorly-oriented phenomena is often hard to articulate, given the right circumstances of time and space to ponder, and often much to their surprise, most skilful practitioners *can* explicate various aspects of how their practice takes place interiorly and sociomaterially at a very fine resolution. Perhaps it is the very challenge of articulating one's process, as seen in this inquiry, that explains why despite significant interest in knowing and meaning, this phenomena has in many practice research traditions been overlooked and under-researched.

The third research question: 'How do these gestures (and other insights that emerge from the data) speak to the research interests of the relevant communicative planning, urban design, property development and architectural literatures?' has been answered in several ways. In communicative planning, where much of the focus has been on public planning as social process, the gestures open a door to understanding communicative acts as social and intrapersonal. They also provide communicative insight for public planners into how planning practice and practice outcomes, including plans and policies, are integrated into private development practice, and through close association imply a way for public planners to leverage this which could well be a fruitful area for further research). In the urban design literature which attends to aspects of creative practice in public planning (such as Albrechts 2005) and highlights the importance of looking for ways to create integrative design across public-private boundaries in urban landscapes (such as Sternberg 2000), the gestures reinforce the characterisation of development as primarily commercially-oriented. They also suggest a way that public planners might counteract such tendencies (again, this demands further research) and foster the realisation of built product that promotes coherence and protects the 'noncommodifiable' aspects of urban form. The gestures emerging from the developer data complement the work of researchers such as Coiacetto (2000, 2001) who seek a more detailed appreciation of private developer practice. The findings suggest that each of the practice traditions discussed, and architectural theory, will benefit from the unpacking of finer grained aspects of architectural practice in relationship to public planning and private development practice.

7.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

These findings have contributed to an understanding of architectural and private developer practice as complex and, at one and the same time, interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented. The data shows that skilful architectural practice emphasises a reliance on the gestures that underpin the 'metaprocess of problem-solving' and 'metaprocess of designing', and that private developer practice emphasises a reliance

on the gestures which underpin the 'metaprocess of problem-solving', 'metaprocess of designing' and 'metaprocess of negotiating'. That is to say that not only are there resonances across these disciplines at a very fine resolution in terms on their reliance on the felt sense in problem-solving, but there are also resonances at a slightly coarser resolution in designing and negotiating and when dealing with matters relating more directly to bringing something into the world, such as architectural plans or built product.

The significance of these findings is twofold. The work of private architects and developers on urban development processes typically gives a central role to the interests of developers and consumers (and financiers), while public sector planners and urban designers work predominantly in the interests of politicians and the broader public good. This research has uncovered intricacies of and resonance between architectural and developer practice which may be pedagogically significant for both private sector professionals in the same or associated disciplines and for public sector planners and designers. If those working in urban development settings could learn to be more creative and communicative, and as a result more sensitive to the needs and expectations of other key stakeholders, as these findings which point to a reliance on the felt sense suggest, then it is quite likely that the quality of processes and process outcomes such as built form would be enhanced.

Paying careful attention to one's own bodily and experientially-oriented processes (such as those delineated by Gendlin 1996; Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) is a way to pay careful attention to the sociomaterial context of one's projects. While skilful private sector professionals such as architects and developers rely on such felt sensitivity primarily in order to meet the needs of property markets, it is quite possible that skilful public planners do something similar. It is also possible that novice and/or less experienced professionals working in urban development settings in either sector could learn to leverage such sensitivity more skilfully. Of course, one would hope (and to some extent expect) that such skills in the public sector would be imbued with aspirations of working in the interests of the affected public (and their political representatives). The modes of

feeling-thinking identified and explicated in this thesis, spanning metaprocesses of problem-solving, designing and negotiating, are intended as a contribution in this direction. They are intended to speak most obviously to the fine resolution interests of communicative planning theorists such as Forester (1989), Healey (1992a, 1992b, 1997) and Innes (1995, 1998a) but also to those working in the same or associated disciplines and with similarly fine grained interests such as architectural design (including Pallasmaa 2009, 2013; Alexander1979), urban design (such as Albrechts 2005, 2015; Madanipour 1997; Sternberg 2000; Higgins and Morgan 2000) and property development practice (such as Coacietto 2000, 2001; Guy and Henneberry 2002).

The research sought to address the distance that often exists between public planning practice and the realisation of built product, and has demonstrated that there is scope to better integrate design, negotiation and regulation into a wider conversation about urban development. Most land use planning and regulation that shapes private sector development precedes construction, and much that is relevant to what is built occurs prior to developers taking an interest in a site, leaving much detail to the interpretation of private sector professionals. In addition, public sector political sensitivities and private sector power plays often leave public plans, policies and practice open to radical, unexpected and perhaps corrupt turns. Understanding how private sector development professionals such as architects and developers transition between urban plans and policies to architectural detail and built product is an important part of understanding how public planning aspirations are realised.

Looking closely at architectural and private developer practice has resulted in an intricate and experientially-oriented understanding of three crucial skills – problem-solving, designing and negotiating. The insights gained from understanding how the gestures influence practice, how they are mobilised by skilful practitioners and how they relate to planning practices, and how the metaprocesses of designing and negotiating resonate with similar elements in planning practice offer a powerful window through which to reconsider planning.

7.4 OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

One way to carry this research forward would be to carry out a similar study looking specifically at the kinds of gestures that other practitioners such as public planners (including urban designers), financiers, politicians and engineers rely on in their work. Another line of inquiry that may be of interest in future research is looking at ways one can build on the model presented here by carefully unpacking how power is dispersed and distributed at a fine resolution. It became apparent through this research that skilfulness does not equate to empathy or care, but rather can result in skilful manipulation and/or corruption. There is nothing in the model of practices, as it stands, that addresses this potential or in the recruitment process that qualified the participants as caring or democratically-oriented. They were chosen based on peer recognition and experience. As it is presented, the model seeks to show how skilful architectural and developer practices takes place at a fine resolution but not how such practices might be beneficial or detrimental to democratic process and process outcomes. Additionally, there is an opportunity to widen the geographical net in relation to skilful private sector architectural and developer practice in other Western democratically-oriented societies such as Europe, the United Kingdom and the Americas to explore how cultural and sociospatial difference shapes professional practice. Focusing on alternative but politically resonant societies raises interesting questions about the place of culture, power and governance in the realisation of built product. Looking comparatively at skilful gestures in other geographical settings may reveal some interesting additional threads and contrasts which enable one to unpack what is going on in practice in a more nuanced way. Moreover, similarly framed research looking at practice traditions associated with urban development and architectural design and/or development practice (such as planning, engineering and finance) may add some interesting strands to the partial models of problem-solving, designing and negotiating which emerged from this thesis. Perhaps when one steps back and looks at the gestures and metaprocesses which came out of the analysis of architectural and developer practice in relationship with each other, there may be something helpful in characterising a new set of gestures that may be carried forward by future research. Testing, refining and expanding on the

gestures and metaprocesses outlined in this these with an inquiry into public planning practice and/or private sector development practice could expand on the gestures and metaprocesses described. Such an exercise could lead to the development of this model of practices into something more intricate and substantial and, therefore, more pedagogically significant.

7.5 AFTERWORD

The purpose of this inquiry was to deliver a model of practices relied on by the participants. Gestures and metaprocesses of problem-solving, designing and negotiating emerged from analysis of reflections on practice by experienced and/or high profile architects and private developers. The analysis deployed constructivist grounded theory methodology (Charmaz 2006) to develop a grounded theory – in this case a process model of practices – which builds understanding of fine resolution aspects of skilful private sector architectural and developer practice.

This inquiry has, perhaps unsurprisingly, raised many more questions than answers. The main learning that I have taken away as a researcher is appreciation for the challenges facing those seeking to, in a convincing way, name the unnamed and make the invisible visible. With the wisdom of hindsight, I can see that the biggest challenge for me was coming to terms with a way of discussing aspects of practice that are not well-articulated within the literature and not easily discussed more generally. I mean this quite literally as it was not until very late in the research that I clarified terms and definitions for a glossary (see Appendix 1: Glossary of Technical Terms of the Model of Practices). The primary challenge I faced in this research process, was in learning to effectively articulate what I could 'see' (in a felt sense kind of way) emerging from the data. This took me some time and many iterations of analysis.

I trust that I have succeeded, at least to the extent that the skills (gestures and metaprocesses) uncovered in the model of practices presented are recognised as being of potential significance to architects, developers and public planners, particularly those

who view the planning, design and delivery of built product as a creative, communicative and interactive task. They may also be of interest to architects, property developers and others involved in private development processes who wish to provoke creative business practice within their project teams and organisational networks. Problem-solving, designing and negotiating are, after all, representative of a large part of what goes on during design and delivery processes, land use planning and regulation and more broadly in the governance of organisational enterprise.

REFERENCES:

Abel C (1981) 'Function of Tacit Knowing in Design', Design Studies, 2:4, pp. 209-214

Abel C (2014) *The extended self: Architecture, memes and minds*, Manchester University Press, Manchester

Adams D and Tiesdell S (2010) 'Planners as market actors: rethinking state-market relations in land and property', Planning Theory & Practice, 11:2, 187-207, DOI: 10.1080/14649351003759631

Albrechts L (2005) 'Creativity as a drive for change', Planning Theory, 4:3, pp. 247-269

Albrechts L (2006) 'Shifts in strategic spatial planning? Some evidence from Europe and Australia', Environment and Planning A, 38, pp. 1149-1170

Albrechts L (2015), 'Ingredients for a more radical strategic spatial planning', Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design 2015, 42, pp. 510-525

Albrechts L (2004) 'Shifts in Strategic Spatial Planning: Some Evidence from Europe and Australia', paper presented at the Aesop Congress, Grenoble

Albrechts L (2006) 'Shifts in strategic spatial planning? Some evidence from Europe and Australia', Environment and Planning A, 38, pp. 1149-1170

Alexander C, Ishikawa S, Silverstein M, with Jacobson M, Fiksdahl-King I and Shlomo A (1977) *A pattern language: Time buildings construction*, Oxford University Press, Berkeley, California

Alexander C (1979) *The timeless way of building*, Oxford University Press, New York

Arakawa and Gins M (2002) *Architectural body*, The University of Alabama Press, London

Asselin, M. E (2003) 'Insider research: Issues to consider when doing qualitative research in your own setting', Journal for Nurses in Staff Development, 19:2, pp. 99-103

Bachelard G (1994) *The poetics of space: The classic look at how we experience intimate spaces*, Beacon Press, Boston

Bäcklund P and Mäntysalo R (2010) 'Agonism and institutional ambiguity: Ideas on democracy and the role of participation in the development of planning theory and practice – the case of Finland', Planning Theory, 9:4, pp. 333–350, DOI: 10.1177/1473095210373684

Baer W (1997) 'Toward design of regulations for the built environment', Environment and Planning B, 24:1, pp. 37-57

Ball M (1998) 'Institutions in British property research: A review', Urban Studies, 35:9, pp. 1501-1517

Ball R (2002) 'Developers in local property markets: Assessing the implications of developer experiences and attitudes in the re-use of vacant industrial buildings in an old industrial area', in: Guy S and Henneberry J (eds) (2002) *Development and developers: Perspectives on property*, Blackwell Publishing Company, Oxford, pp. 158-180

Beauregard R (2005), The Textures of Property Markets: Downtown Housing and Office Conversions in New York City, Urban Studies, 42:13, pp. 2431–2445

Bentley I (1999) *Urban Transformations: Power, People and Urban Design*, Routledge, London

Bertolini F and Clercq FL (2005) 'Sustainable accessibility: a conceptual framework to integrate transport and land use plan-making. Two test-applications in the Netherlands and a reflection on the way forward', Transport Policy, 12:3, pp. 207-220

Billingham J (ed.) 1994, *Urban Design Source Book*, Urban Design Group, London

Bloomer K and Moore C (1977) *Body, Memory and Architecture*, Yale University, London

Bourdieu P (1977) *Outline of a theory of practice*, Nice R (Translator), Cambridge University Press, New York

Bourdieu P (1990) *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*, Oxford, Polity Press

Campbell S (1996) 'Green Cities, Growing Cities, Just Cities?: Urban Planning and the Contradictions of Sustainable Development', Journal of the American Planning Association, 62:3, pp. 296-312, DOI: 10.1080/01944369608975696

Campbell C (2006) 'Just planning: the art of situated ethical judgement', Journal of Planning Education and Research, 26, pp. 92-106

Carmona M, Heath T, Oc T, and Tiesdell S (2003) *Public places — urban spaces: The dimensions of urban design*, Architectural Press, Oxford

Carmona M (2009) 'Design Coding and the Creative, Market and Regulatory Tyrannies of Practice', Urban Studies, 46:12, pp. 2643–2667

Charmaz K (2006) *Constructing grounded theory,* Second Edition, SAGE Publications Limited, London

Coiacetto E (2000) 'Places shape place shapers? Real estate developers' outlooks concerning community, Planning and Development Differ between Places', Planning Practice & Research, 15:4, pp. 353-374

Coiacetto, E (2001) 'Diversity in real estate developer behaviour', Urban Policy and Research, 19:1, pp. 43-59

Corbyn Dwyer S and Buckle J (2009) 'The space between: On being an insider-outside in qualitative research', International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8:1, pp. 54-63

Costley C, Eliott G and Gibbs P (2010), *Doing work based research: Approaches to enquiry for insider-researchers*, Sage, London

Creswell J (1998) *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions,* Thousand Oaks, Sage, California

Cross N (2001) 'Designerly ways of knowing: design discipline versus design science', Design Issues, 17:3, pp. 49-55

Cuff D (1992) *Architecture: The story of practice*, MIT Press, Cambridge

Davis H (2006) *The Culture of Building*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

D'Arcy E and Keogh G (2002) 'The market context of property development activity', in: Guy S and Henneberry J (eds) (2002) *Development and developers: Perspectives on property*, Blackwell Publishing Company, Oxford

de Beauvoir S (1972) *The second sex,* Pashley HM (Translator) Penguin, Harmondsworth

Deleuze G (1978) Seminar given on Spinoza on 24 January 1978, Link: https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/14

Dewey J (2005), *Art as experience*, The Berkeley Publishing Group, New York

Emirbayer M (1997) 'Manifesto for a relational sociology', The American Journal of Sociology, 103, pp. 281-317

Faulconbridge J (2010) 'Global architects: learning and innovation through communities and constellations of practice', Environment and Planning A, 42, pp. 2842-2858

Fainstein S (2000) 'New directions in planning theory', Urban Affairs Review, 35, pp. 451–78

Fisher R and Ury W (1999) *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*, The Random House Group, London

Flyvberg B (1998) *Rationality and Power*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Forester, J (1980) 'Critical theory and planning practice', Journal of the American Planning Association, 46:2, pp. 275-286, DOI: 10.1080/01944368008977043

Forester, J (1982) 'Planning in the face of power', Journal of the American Planning Association, 48:1, pp. 67-80, DOI: 10.1080/01944368208976167

Forester J (1985) 'Designing: Making sense together in practical conversations', Journal of Architectural Education, 38:3, pp. 12-20

Forester J (1989) *Planning in the face of power*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California

Forester J (2006) 'Making Participation Work When Interests Conflict: Moving from Facilitating Dialogue and Moderating Debate to Mediating Negotiations', Journal of the American Planning Association, 72:4, pp. 447-456, DOI: 10.1080/01944360608976765

Forester J (2015) 'What kind of research might help us become better planners?', Planning Theory and Practice, 16:2015, pp. 145-148

Franck K and Lepori B (2007) *Architecture from the inside out: From the body, the senses, the site, and the community*, John Wiley & Sons, England

Gendlin (2013) 'Arakawa and Gins: The Organism-Person-Environment Process', Issue of Inflexions Journal, Link: http://www.inflexions.org/n6_gendlin.html

Gendlin, ET (1965/1966), 'Experiential explication and truth', Journal of Existentialism, 6, pp. 131-146, Link: http://www.focusing.org/gendlin/docs/gol_2028.html

Gendlin ET (1996) *Focusing oriented psychotherapy: A manual of the experiential method*, The Guilford Press, New York

Gendlin ET (1997a) *Experiencing and the creation of meaning: A philosophical and psychological approach to the subjective,* Northwestern University Press, Illinois

Gendlin ET (1997b) *A process model*, Focusing Institute, New York

Gendlin ET (2007) *Focusing*, Bantam Books, New York, New York

Giddens A (1984) *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*, Polity Press, Cambridge

Glaser BG and Strauss AL (2008) *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*, Aldine Transaction, London

Gore T and Nicholson D (1991), 'Models of the land-development process: a critical review', Environment and Planning A, 23, pp. 705-730

Gunder M (2008) 'Ideaologies of certainty in a risky reality: Beyond the hauntology of planning', Planning Theory, 7:2, pp. 186-206

Gunder M (2011) 'Commentary: Is urban design still urban planning? An exploration and response', Journal of Planning Education and Research, 31:2, pp. 184-195

Guy S (2002), 'Developing interests: Environmental innovation and the social organisation of the property business', in: *Development and developers: Perspectives on property*, Blackwell Publishing Company, Oxford

Guy S and Henneberry J (eds) (2002) *Development and developers: Perspectives on property*, Blackwell Publishing Company, Oxford

Habermas J (1984) *The theory of communicative action*, McCarthy T (Translator), Beacon Press, Boston

Habraken J (2005) *Palladio's Children*, Taylor and Francis, Abingdon

Healey P (1991) 'Models of the development process: A review', Journal of Property Research, 8:3, pp. 219-238

Healey P (1992a) 'Planning through debate: The communicative turn in planning theory', The Town Planning Review, 63:2, pp. 143-162

Healey P (1992b) 'A planner's day: Knowledge and action in communicative practice', Journal of the American Planning Association, 58:1, pp. 9-20, DOI: 10.1080/01944369208975531

Healey P (1992c) 'An institutional model of the development process', Journal of Property Research, 9:1, pp. 33-44

Healey P (1996) 'The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory and its Implications for Spatial Strategy Formation', 23:2, pp. 217-234

Healey P (1997/2006) *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*, Macmillan Press Ltd, London

Healey P (1998) 'Collaborative planning in a stakeholder society', Town Planning Review, 69:1, pp. 1-21, DOI: 10.3828/tpr.69.1.h651u2327m86326p

Healey P (2003), 'Collaborative planning in perspective', Planning Theory, 2:2, pp. 101-123

Healey P (2004) 'Creativity and urban governance', Policy Studies, 25:2, pp. 87-102, DOI: 10.1080/0144287042000262189

Healey P (2006) 'Relational complexity and the imaginative power of strategic spatial planning 1', European Planning Studies, 14:4, pp. 525-546

Heidegger M (1996) Being and time, SUNY Press, Albany

Hendricks M (2001) 'Focusing-oriented/experiential psychotherapy', in: Cain D and Seeman J (eds), *Humanistic psychotherapy: handbook of research and practice*, American Psychological Association, New York, pp. 221-251

Henneberry J and Parris S (2013) 'The embedded developer: using project ecologies to analyse local property development networks', The Town Planning Review, 2013, 84:2, pp. 227-249

Higgins M and Morgan J (2000) 'The role of creativity in planning: The 'creative practitioner'', Planning Practice & Research, 15:1-2, pp. 117-127

Hillier J (2002) 'Direct action and agonism in democratic planning practice', in: Allmendinger P and Tewdr-Jones M (eds), *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory,* Routledge, London, pp. 110-135

Hillier J (2003) 'Agon'izing over Consensus: Why Habermasian Ideals Cannot Be "Real"', Planning Theory, 2:1, pp. 37–59

Hillier J and Gunder M (2003) 'Planning fantasies? An exploration of a potential Lacanian framework for understanding development assessment planning', Planning Theory, 2:3, pp. 225-248

Husserl, E (2012), *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*, Routledge Classics, London

Imrie R (2007) 'The interrelationships between building regulations and architects' practices', Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, 34, pp. 925- 943

Imrie R and Street E (2009) 'Regulating Design: The Practices of Architecture, Governance and Control', Urban Studies, 46:12, pp. 2507-2518

Imrie R and Thomas H (1993) 'The limits of property-led regeneration', Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space, 11:1, pp. 87-102

Innes J (1995) 'Planning theory's emerging paradigm: Communicative action and interactive practice', Journal of Planning Education and Research, 14:3, pp. 183-189

Innes J (1998a) 'Information in communicative planning', Journal of the American Planning Association, 64:1, pp. 52-63, DOI: 10.1080/01944369808975956

Innes J (1998b) 'VIEWPOINT: Challenge and creativity in postmodern planning', Town Planning Review, 69:2, pp. v-ix

Innes J 2004, 'Consensus building: Clarifications for the critics', Planning Theory, 3:1, pp. 5-20, DOI: 10.1177/1473095204042315

Innes J and Booher D (1999) 'Consensus Building and Complex Adaptive Systems', Journal of the American Planning Association, 65:4, pp. 412-423, DOI:10.1080/01944369908976071

Institute of Design at Stanford (2017) An introduction to design thinking: process guide, Link: https://dschool-old.stanford.edu/sandbox/groups/designresources/wiki/36873/attachments/74b3d/ModeGuideBOOTCAMP2010L.pdf?sessionID=573efa71aea50503341224491c862e32f5edc0a9

Jacobs J (1961) *Death and life of great American cities*, Random House, New York

Knox PL (1987) 'The social production of the built environment architects, architecture and the postmodern city', Progress in Human Geography, 11, pp. 354-377

Kvale S (1992) 'Ten standard responses to qualitative research interviews', Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 1992, pp. 1-30

Latour B (2005) *Reassembling the social: an introduction to actor-network-theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Lefebvre H (1991) *The production of space*, Nicholson-Smith D (Translator), Blackwell, Oxford

Levinas E (1969) *Totality and infinity: An essay of exteriority*, Lingis A (Translator), Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Lorne C (2017) 'Spatial agency and practising architecture beyond buildings', Social & Cultural Geography, 18, pp. 268-287

Loughran JJ (2002) 'Effective Reflective Practice: In Search of Meaning in Learning about Teaching', Journal of Teacher Education, 53:1, pp. 33-43

Lynch K (1960) *The Image of the City*, The MIT Press, Cambridge

Madanipour A (1997) 'Ambiguities of urban design', The Town Planning Review, 68:3, pp. 363-383

McGuirk P (2001) 'Situating communicative planning theory: context, power, and knowledge', Environment and Planning A, 33, pp. 195-217

McCan, T and Clark E (2003a) 'Grounded theory in nursing research: Part 2—Critique', Nurse Researcher, 11:2, pp. 19-28

McCann T and Clark E (2003b) 'Grounded theory in nursing research: Part 3—Application', Nurse Researcher, 11:2, pp. 29-39

McNeil D (2006) 'Globalization and the ethics of architectural design', City, 10, pp. 49-58

Merleau-Ponty M (1968) *The visible and the invisible*, Northwestern University Press, Illinois

Merleau-Ponty M (2002) *Phenomenology of Perception*, Smith C (Translator), Routledge Classics, New York

Michalko M (2001) *Cracking Creativity*, Ten Speed Press, Berkeley

Mills J, Bonner A and Francis K (2006a) 'The development of constructivist grounded theory', International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5:1, pp. 25–35

Mills J, Bonner A and Francis K (2006b) 'Adopting a constructivist approach to grounded theory: Implications for research design', International Journal of Nursing Practice, 12:1, pp. 8-13, DOI: 10.1111/j.1440-172x.2006.00543.x

Mouffe C (2000) 'Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism', in: Reihe Politikwissenschaft/Institut für Höhere Studien, Abt. Politikwissenschaft, 72

Mintzberg H (1973) *The nature of managerial work*, Harper and Row, New York

Nicolini D (2012) *Practice theory, work and organisation: An introduction*, Oxford University Press, United Kingdom

Norberg-Schulz C (1977) *Genius loci: Towards a phenomenology of architecture*, Rizzoli, New York

Ohrstrom B (2000) 'Old buildings for new enterprises: The Swedish approach', in: *Industrial Buildings: Heritage and conservation*, Stratton M (ed.), E & FN Spon, London

Osterman, K and Kottkamp R (1993) *Reflective practice for educators: Improving schooling through professional development*, Corwin Press Inc., California

Pallasmaa J (2000) 'Hapticity and time: Notes on a fragile architecture', Architectural Review, 207:1239, pp. 78-84

Pallasmaa J (2009) *The thinking hand: Existential and embodied wisdom in architecture*, John Wiley & Sons Limited, United Kingdom

Pallasmaa J (2013) *The eyes of the skin: Architecture and the senses*, John Wiley & Sons Limited, United Kingdom

Pallasmaa J (2014) 'Empathic imagination: Formal and experiential projection', Architectural Design, 84:5, pp. 80-85

Parlington G (2001) 'Qualitative research interviews: Identifying problems in technique', Edith Cowan University Research Online, Link: http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworks/4368/

Petitmengin-Peugeot C (1999) 'The intuitive experience', Journal of Consciousness Studies, 6:2-3, pp. 43-77

Polanyi M (2009) *The tacit dimension*, The University of Chicago Press, London

Reckwitz A (2002) 'Toward a theory of social practices', European Journal of Social Theory, 5:2, pp. 243-63

Richardson T (1996) 'Foucauldian discourse: power and truth in urban and regional policy making', European Planning Studies, 4, pp. 279-92

Rittel H and Webber M (1973), 'Dilemmas in a general theory of planning', Policy Sciences, 4:2, pp. 155-169

Sartre JP (1956) *Being and Nothingness*, Washington Square Press, New York

Schackley S, Wynne B, Waterton C (1996) 'Imagine complexity: The past, present and future of complex thinking', Futures, 28:3, pp. 201-255

Schatzki TR (2001) 'Practice mind-ed orders', in: Theodore R. Schatzki, K. Knorr-Cetina & Eike von Savigny (eds), *The practice turn in contemporary theory*, Routledge, London, pp. 42-55

Schön D and Wiggins G (1992) 'Kinds of seeing in designing,' Creativity and Innovation Management, 1:2, pp. 68-74

Schön D (1983) *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*, Basic Books, United States of America

Schön D (1987) *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

Schön D (1992) 'The crisis of professional knowledge and the pursuit of an epistemology of practice', Journal of Interprofessional Care, 6:1, pp. 49-63

Seamon D (1980) '*Body-subject, time-space routines, and place-ballets*',* in: Buttimer A and Seamon D (eds), *The human experience of place and space*, Croom Helm, London, pp. 148-165

Seamon D (ed.) (1993) *Dwelling, seeing and designing: Toward a phenomenological ecology*, SUNY Press, Albany

Seamon D (1993) 'Dwelling, seeing, and designing: An introduction', in: Seamon D (ed.), *Dwelling, seeing and designing: Toward a phenomenological ecology*, SUNY Press, Albany, pp. 1-24

Seamon D (2000) 'A way of seeing people and place', in: Wapner S, Demick J, Yamamoto T, Minami H (eds), *Theoretical Perspectives in Environment-Behavior Research*, Springer, Boston

Seamon D and Coates G (1993) 'Promoting a foundational ecology practically through Christopher Alexander's pattern language: The example of Meadowcreek', in: Seamon D (ed.), *Dwelling, seeing and designing: Toward a phenomenological ecology*, SUNY Press, Albany, pp. 331-356

Seamon D and Mugeraurer R (2012) *Dwelling, Place and Environment: Towards a Phenomenology of Person and World*, Springer, Boston

Simon H (1969) *The Sciences of the Artificial*, MIT Press, Cambridge

Sternberg E (2000) 'An integrative iheory of urban design', Journal of the American Planning Association, 66:3, pp. 265-278, DOI: 10.1080/01944360008976106

Tewdwr-Jones M, Allmendinger P (1998) 'Deconstructing communicative rationality: A critique of Habermasian collaborative planning', Environment and Planning A, 30, pp. 1975 -1989

Till J (2005) 'The negotiation of hope', in: Blundell Jones P, Petrescu D and Till J (eds), *Architecture and Participation,* Routledge, London

Todres L (2007) *Embodied enquiry: Phenomenological touchstones for research, psychotherapy and spirituality*, Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire

Tuan Y (1974) *Topophilia: Study of environmental perception, attitudes and values*, Columbia University Press, New York

Tuan Y (2011) *Space and place: The perspective of experience*, University of Minnesota Press, London

Yiftachel O and Huxley M (2000), 'Situating communicative planning theory: context, power, and knowledge', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 24, pp. 907-13

Van Manen M (1990) *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*, SUNY Press, Albany, New York

Van Manen M (2014) *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-giving methods in phenomenological research and writing*, Left Coast Press, California

Vitruvius (also known as Pollio V) (2007), in: Rowland I and Noble Howe T (eds), *Ten Books on Architecture*, Cambridge University Press, New York

Walkerden G (2005) 'Felt knowing: a foundation for local government practice', in: Keen M., Brown V. and Dyball R. (eds) 2005*, Social learning in environmental management*, Earthscan, London, pp. 170-187

Walkerden G (2009) 'Researching and developing practice traditions using reflective practice experiments', Quality and Quantity, 43, pp. 249-263

Wenger E (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning Meaning and Identity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Wittgenstein L (1953) Philosophical investigations, Blackwell, Oxford

Wittgenstein L (1969) On certainty, Blackwell, Oxford

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX 1: GLOSSARY OF TECHNICAL TERMS OF THE MODEL OF PRACTICES:

'brokering' (Chapter 5): 'Brokering' is a gesture of drawing together whatever resources are needed in order to design and deliver an 'image' in built product. Developers rely on 'brokering' as a means to trade or transact successfully with others. Like 'committing', 'brokering' is about promising to do something in return for something else. 'Brokering' is about everyday transacting with others that carries development projects towards completion but does not necessary involve a milestone such as a legally binding contract. 'Immersing', 'imagining' and 'testing' (and the finer grained interiorly-oriented gestures) are implied in 'brokering' as one seeks to find a way to meet one's own needs and expectations, and those of others. 'Brokering' spans much entrepreneurial activity and in the case of developers involves attempting to meet the needs of key stakeholders. The way developer's broker deals is in many cases, although not always, directly tied to an anticipated return (i.e. return on investment). 'Brokering' may not translate to an explicit agreement between two parties to exchange something but rather presents as a longer term process of give and take which sometimes translates to what may look like only giving or only taking in the shorter term, but the exchange value is generally intended to even out over time.

'committing' (Chapter 5): The gesture of 'committing' is a process of agreeing (either implicitly or explicitly) to something. Property developers are 'committing' throughout development processes implicitly by allowing the project to take a specific direction (given they are in many ways an authority on their own private projects), and explicitly by engaging certain specialists, acquiring sites, executing financial agreements and preparing sales and/or leasing contracts etc. Developers commit skilfully and with a sense of integration between the felt sense and their 'image' of what might work in the project context. They also commit unwisely, reactively and with little sensitivity to the risks and potential return of their actions. The 'committing' referred to here is that which is done skilfully and with a felt appreciation of fit. It is an iterative and evolving process of agreeing to proceed which is at play in different ways from inception to completion.

'connecting' (Chapters 4 and 5):[39]: 'Connecting' refers to the gesture of finding a symbol to represent an aspect of experiencing. One 'gets a handle' and 'resonates the handle' (which may be in the form of images, words and/or feelings) until one arrives at a sense of 'fit' between the aspect of experiencing one is attending to (in the form of a felt sense) and the symbol/s employed to represent that particular aspect of experiencing.

gesture (Chapter 3): Building on the work of Gendlin and Petitmengin-Peugeot, a gesture is identified as a communicative action or performance that carries meaning. Gestures are intricately woven into the fabric of what goes on in the world, broadly speaking, regardless of the narrowness of context within which the gesture may appear to come about. Gestures play a role in this research as process descriptions of interiorly-oriented micro (or mini) passages of practice. Gestures are microprocesses created by the one gesturing to carry their process

[39] The gesture of 'connecting' (along with the gestures of 'letting go', 'listening' and 'receiving') draws on Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999) in a way that creates a somewhat different synthesis compared with the compressed definitions (of Gendlin 1996 and Petitmengin-Peugeot 1999) contained in TABLE 4.1 (p. 117) of this thesis.

forward in some way. They come from the meaning one gives to 'felt experience' (Gendlin 1997a), and are shaped by the skills one relies on in professional life.

'imagining' (Chapters 4 and 5): 'Imagining' typically follows the gesture of 'immersing' and refers to the way developers provoke an 'image' out of felt understanding of a situation, prior to and as part of, seeking to bring an 'image' to life in built product. The 'image' here is more than 'the handle' one might have when 'receiving' because it becomes a complex artefact. It is a process of 'getting and resonating a handle' on one's felt experiencing of how to carry forward a particular development opportunity toward completion.

'immersing' (Chapters 4 and 5): The gesture of 'immersing' refers to the way information is selected and absorbed as a means to 'getting and resonating a handle' on project scope and conditions. At the early stages of a project, developers seek out information in an attempt to understand opportunities and constraints, and to provoke potential solutions. 'Immersing' is primarily about searching for ('listening') and finding ('receiving') context relevant information. It is primarily a process of coming to terms with project conditions and key stakeholder interests.

'letting go' (Chapters 4 and 5):[40] 'Letting go' is a gesture of slowing down and releasing bodily tensions that may prevent one from finding a connection with oneself. It offers a way to open up to future possibilities – to the new and the fresh. It may be relied on in two main ways. As a general act of 'letting go' to 'create a space' for fresh thinking without a particular focus in mind, or as a way to make space for fresh thoughts with a particular issue in mind. In both cases, 'letting go' offers to release distractions and instate a curiosity for what may come.

'listening' (Chapters 4 and 5):[41] The gesture of 'listening' is a process of priming oneself to pay attention to what may come from the felt sense (that is, from 'receiving'). 'Listening' is characterised by a leaning toward an answer (referred to as 'asking' by Gendlin 1996) 'Listening' is a of a kind of poised attention and evenly distributed bodily scanning which begins after 'letting go' and 'connecting', and comes before 'receiving'.

metaprocess (Chapter 3): A 'metaprocess' describes a group of fine grained gestures which deployed together do something more general. The metaprocesses discussed in this thesis are the 'metaprocess of problem-solving' (underpinned by gestures coming out of the work of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot (1999)), 'metaprocess of designing' and 'metaprocess of negotiating'. This extends the concept of gestures, and came about through an iterative analytical process which resulted in the explication of metaprocesses taking place at a coarser resolution (and underpinned by distinct gestures). The term 'metaprocess' is not intended to imply a strong hierarchical frame; it is intended to describe a familial relationship between certain sets of finer grained gestures and to indicate that certain gestures combine functionally to achieve something.

'metaprocess of designing' (Chapters 4 and 5): The 'metaprocess of designing' is primarily a reflection of architectural design practice. It includes the interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'immersing', 'imagining', 'testing', 'persevering' and 'unwinding'.

'metaprocess of negotiating' (discussed in Chapter 5): The 'metaprocess of negotiating' is primarily a reflection of private developer practice. It includes the interiorly-and-sociomaterially-oriented gestures of 'togethering', 'brokering' and 'committing'.

'metaprocess of problem-solving' (Chapters 4 and 5): The 'metaprocess of problem-solving' is a reflection of the fine grained process model work of Gendlin (1996) and Petitmengin-Peugeot

[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid.

(1999). It includes the interiorly-oriented gestures of 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving'.

microprocess(es): refer definition of 'gesture'.

'persevering' (Chapters 4 and 5): The gesture of 'persevering' refers to a decision to continue in a particular direction. 'Persevering' is at play when one feels a sense of integration between the felt sense and the 'image' they have in mind. In doing so, they sense they are on the 'right' path and so continue in a similar or somewhat anticipated direction. It is a process step of persisting with and extending on an earlier step, as opposed to 'unwinding'. In some instances, 'persevering' can be considered an act of defiance in the face of opposition of some kind.

'receiving' (Chapters 4 and 5):[42] 'Receiving' is about heeding the felt sense. It points to a stirring in the felt sense; to receive is to let this stirring or experiential process step be, even if it seems out of place or unrealistic (Gendlin 1996). What may start as a stirring in the felt sense is then resonated with (or 'tested' against) symbolic representations such as words, images and/or feelings. This process of 'resonating a handle' is about making sense of what comes via 'receiving'. One aspires to having a sense of integration between the felt sense and the symbol/s used to represent it in relation to a particular aspect of experiencing. It is a process which culminates in a moment of insight or 'aha!'. 'Receiving' is the moment of intuition which illuminates the next step. It is experienced as a sense of knowing and implies 'letting go', 'connecting' and 'listening'.

'testing' (Chapters 4 and 5): 'Testing' is primarily a gesture of finding a more refined fit between the felt sense and a symbolic representation (i.e. word, image or feeling). It is a process of checking the intricacies of an 'image' (architectural or construction detail of the imagined space, for example) in order to carry the project closer toward practical completion. 'Testing' offers a way for property developers to check the soundness of their preliminary intuitions (which come from 'immersing and 'imagining') against more intricate and complex technical requirements. 'Testing' relies on prior gestures of 'immersing' and 'imagining' (and the underlying gestures of problem-solving) as means to generate ideas worth evaluating (or 'testing').

'togethering' (Chapter 5): 'Togethering' is a gesture of working with others. It is a process of two or more people (sometimes with different professional experience, backgrounds and competing interests) coming together to work on an aspect of a project. 'Togethering' implies 'letting go', 'connecting', 'listening' and 'receiving' interiorly as a means to getting along socially. Given that two or more people are involved, it also implies 'brokering'. 'Togethering' refers to the way developers go about co-creating throughout sociopolitical development processes.

'unwinding' (Chapters 4 and 5): The gesture of 'unwinding' refers to a process of discontinuation or reversal. This gesture offers a way for developers 'letting go' of a particular direction to find another (perhaps better) way. A process of 'unwinding' does not imply that one made a mistake but rather that after having taken a few steps (and tested the implications of those steps against one's intentions or 'image'), one recognises that there is perhaps a better way to take the project toward completion. In some instances, 'unwinding' is considered an act of surrender in the face of opposition or obstruction of some kind but it is not always that. In other cases, 'unwinding' may come about from simply recognising another and more fitting way.

[42] Ibid.

APPENDIX 2: INDICATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Overarching research questions and approach:

How might sensitivity of professional practitioners to tacit knowledge and embodied experience encourage more sustainable architecture, property development and place making within the built environment?

These interviews will be focused upon how particular professional experiences present themselves in practice (and with reference to project examples) with a particular focus on felt bodily processes and what meaning and significance is given to these processes which influences decision making.

- What constitutes current professional practice in terms of design and delivery of built environments that promote well-being;
- What role do tacit knowing and embodied experiencing play in this;
- How does current masterful professional practice shape real world excellence;
- What lessons might be drawn from an inquiry into current masterful practice;
- How aware are masterful practitioners of their tacit knowing and embodied experiencing? In what ways does this awareness vary? How does it guide their practice;
- What professional practices are these masterful practitioners using to be sensitive to tacit knowing and embodied experiencing;
- What do they think would encourage would encourage more sustainability/ liveability within the built environment?

Sample interview themes and questions:

Tacit Knowledge, Creativity, Inspiration and Decision Making

Reflect for a moment on an idea for a project that felt particularly inspired and creative. Maybe an idea for a project that turned out to be well timed and fortuitous. How did this idea come to you? How did it make you feel? How was your body touched by this? Do you recall any particular sensations or images? How did you know it was a good idea and worth pursuing? Can you describe how this particular idea took shape and how you went about bringing it in to reality? If you were to name 3 practices that support you to be creative and to feel inspired what would they be?

Tacit Knowledge and problem-solving

Reflect for a moment on a time when a complex and potentially harmful problem came to light which threatened the successful delivery of a project, for example a time delay, cost overrun or design issue. What feelings or sensations did you experience at this time? Do you recall changes in these feelings or sensations from when the problem was brought to your attention and as it was being attended to? Can you describe the feelings or sensations you experienced once this particular issue was resolved? If you were to name 3 practices that support your problem-solving what would they be?

Masterful design and delivery

Reflect on one of the projects that you have worked on that stands out as particularly successful. How did you know when you were on to a good idea? How did you know when the design and delivery of the project was on track? Were there particular sensations or feelings associated with these times? Can you describe them? How did you know when there was an issue? Were there particular sensations or feelings associated with these times? Can you describe them? Do you have particular practices that support your creativity and inspiration? How do these practices make you feel? Is there anything in particular that hinders creativity and success? How do these/ does this make you feel? How did you decide to use [x] materials/ design elements and construction methods? Were there particular feelings or sensations that prompted these decisions?

APPENDIX 3: ETHICS APPROVAL (DATED 22 OCT 2014)

ethics.secretariat@mq.edu.au <ethics.secretariat@mq.edu.au> 22 October 2014 18:05
To: greg.walkerden@mq.edu.au
Cc: kate.mccauley@students.mq.edu.au

Re: 5201400924; "The sensitivity of key stakeholders to their tacit knowing and embodied experiencing for the design and delivery of sustainable built environments"

Dear Dr Walkerden

This research project was granted ethical approval by the relevant committee on 22/10/2014.

You may view this record online at the IRIS website (https://iris.mq.edu.au/rmenet) - this email is not your approval letter.

Please ensure that any institutional research governance requirements (e.g. insurance, Working with Children Check, approval to travel, etc.) have been completed before you commence this research.

If you need to advise Macquarie University that the project will not be completed, please log in to the IRIS website (https://iris.mq.edu.au/rmenet) to open and discontinue your application.

If you wish to make any future changes to this research project (including personnel), you will be required to process an "Amendment Request".

Regards
Human Ethics Secretariat

APPENDIX 4: PROFORMA PARTICIPANT EMAIL INVITATION

Dear [potential participant/ leading practitioner],

As a leading practitioner within the property industry involved in the delivery of particularly liveable and sustainable built environments, you are invited to participate in the PhD research project of Ms Kate McCauley (Macquarie University) centred on the ways in which the professional sensitivity - for example the different ways in which one pauses and reflects and feels into their situations when designing, interpreting or making advantageous decisions - may guide the design and delivery of leading liveable and sustainable built environments.

This purpose of this research is to explore the relationship between the sensitivity of leading practitioners/key stakeholders (for instance, architects or developers such as yourself), and the liveability and sustainability associated with the built environments they design and deliver.

This notion will be explored via semi-structured interviews and feedback sessions with myself, focussed on your skilful professional practice with particular attention to the sensitivity and appreciation of tacit knowing - for instance the feel for the circumstances you find yourself in and how you determine what is at stake and is the most appropriate way forward.

If you think you may be interesting in taking part in this research, please respond either via return email or by phoning my mobile [redacted]. I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

With thanks and kind regards,

Kate McCauley

PhD Candidate
Department of Environment and Geography
Macquarie University

APPENDIX 5: PROFORMA INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM

Macquarie University Research Project Participant
Information and Consent Form

Principal Investigator: Dr Greg Walkerden
Investigator: Professor Richie Howitt
Investigator and PhD Candidate: Ms Kate McCauley

Dear [insert name],

Re Project: The sensitivity of key stakeholders to their tacit knowing for the design and delivery of leading liveable and sustainable built environments

As a leading practitioner you are invited to participate in the PhD research project of Ms Kate McCauley centred on the ways in which the sensitivity of leading practitioners - for example the different ways in which one pauses and reflects and feels into their situations when designing, interpreting or making advantageous decisions - may guide the design and delivery of leading liveable and sustainable built environments.

This purpose of this research is to explore the relationship between the sensitivity of leading practitioners, and the liveability and sustainability associated with the built environments they design and deliver. This notion will be explored via semi-structured interviews and feedback sessions focussed on the skilful professional practice of leading practitioners, in particular with respect to their sensitivity to tacit knowing - for instance the feel for the circumstances they find themselves in and for what is at stake.

Research team contact details:

The study is being conducted by Kate McCauley (PhD Candidate, Department of Environment and Geography, Macquarie University, Ph: [redacted] Mob: [redacted], email: [redacted]).

The other members of the research team are Dr Greg Walkerden (Department of Environment and Geography, Macquarie University, Ph: [redacted], email: [redacted] and Professor Richard Howitt (Department of Environment and Geography, Macquarie University, Ph: [redacted], email: [redacted]).

Participation:

If you decide to participate, you will be invited to take part in five (5) one (1) hour semi-structured interviews based on the following themes:

- The role of tacit knowing in the design and delivery of leading places;
- The sensitivity of leading practitioners to their tacit knowing;
- How tacit knowing guides leading practice and shapes real world excellence; and
- Lessons that might be drawn from current leading practice.

Interviews will be conducted by Ms Kate McCauley and centred on the ways in which having a 'feel' for one's circumstances and for what is at stake - a tacit, kind of inarticulate, evolving, felt sense of it - provides support for orienting oneself and making advantageous decisions relating to the design and delivery of leading built environments, and for thinking relatively holistically and creatively about project issues as they arise and are resolved.

Approximately six (6) months after the end of the last interview, you will also have the opportunity to participate in one (1) or two (2) one (1) hour long feedback and de-brief session/s with Ms Kate McCauley in person or via phone, skype or email (where appropriate). Additional interviews and feedback and de-brief sessions may be agree between Ms Kate McCauley and participants on a case by case basis.

The interviews, feedback and de-brief sessions will be recorded (digital audio), so that the conversations can be analysed to draw out aspects of what is experienced as helpful professional practice. The results from the research are anticipated to highlight significance in the relationship between key stakeholders and sensitivity to their tacit knowledge, and to provide indications as to how this sensitivity may be applied and integrated into professional practice (via Professional Practice Guidelines), for the benefit of those professionals who come to design and delivery built environments and of those who come to experience these places.

Risks:

In considering the possible risks of participating in this research, two stand out in particular.

- It should be noted that as part of your participation and the signing of this Information and Consent Form, you are expected to be comfortable with being directly identifiable by name and project/s in the research results findings. This may be directly through quotes, professional practices or by association with particular projects. The nature of the research is such that the recognition of participants and their projects is key to highlighting the skilful processes behind the delivery of leading built environments. Publications are planned for a number of Industry Journals and the publication of the PhD Thesis will follow. You may find that being directly identifiable in the research findings means that you have the attention of either the academic or industry communities or both.

- Also, the focus of this research is on skilful practice of leading practitioners within the property industry. This research will culminate in the delivery of Professional Practice Guidelines which are intended to assist other practitioners to be more skilful in their practice. To participate in this research you need to be comfortable in sharing the nature of your skilful professional processes and in particular your sensitivity to tacit knowing and the way that this guides your decisions.

Privacy:

Only members of the research team will have access to the data. A summary of the results of the data can be made available to you on request by emailing Ms Kate McCauley at kate.mccauley@mq.edu.au.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary: you are not obliged to participate and if you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without having to give a reason and without consequence.

I, _____ have read *(or, where appropriate, have had read to me)* and understand the information above and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research, knowing that I can withdraw from further participation in the research at any time without consequence.

Participant's Name:
(Block letters)

Participant's Signature: _____ Date:

Investigator and PhD Candidate's Name:
(Block letters)

Investigator's Signature: _____ __ Date:

The ethical aspects of this study have been approved by the Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have any complaints or reservations about any ethical aspect of your participation in this research, you may contact the Committee through the Director, Research Ethics (telephone (02) 9850 7854; email ethics@mq.edu.au). Any complaint you make will be treated in confidence and investigated, and you will be informed of the outcome.