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OF LIMINALITY:
EXPERIENCING LANDSCAPE IN THE IN-BETWEEN

Would un-familiar settings de-familiarise familiar activities?
An investigation into that leap between thresholds

By Hermi Suhirman

This research explores the potential of liminal or ‘in-between’ spaces to create richer experiences of landscape - both physically and metaphysically. To support this, it is guided by two key considerations. The first is the possibility of developing a typology of such experiences. This is followed by a second deliberation for an associated methodology for inventorying. The latter is targeted as a means of explicitly identifying and recording landscapes that are characteristically liminal, and/or ones that have the potential to create liminal experiences.
The key objective of such inquiries is the eventual understanding as to whether or not, by highlighting the liminal characteristics of landscapes, the sense of place could be altered and be made ‘un-familiar’. What would be interesting is that when such settings are subsequently achieved, the ‘new familiar’ might allow people to see things, be it the place or the experience, anew – a kind of ‘de-familiarising’ the familiar.

The research identified the need to analyse the following key definitions and theoretical positions relevant to understand liminal dimensions of landscape: metaphysical landscapes; and landscape experience. These concepts are considered key to the exploring of experiences that leap between thresholds. They are then used to drive the analysis of case studies, leading to the fine-tuning of current inventorying methods to suit the identification of liminal spaces, and the unravelling of liminal qualities in landscapes.

The research is based on a detailed study of liminal dimensions found on the Rapaki Track in Canterbury’s Port Hills, directly adjacent to the city of Christchurch. Five key sites are examined in terms of their liminal dimensions and in terms of how landscape architectural interventions might further heighten these liminal qualities.

This research consolidates the refinement and packages it into a user-friendly and practical toolkit. Taking the form of a set of method cards, this kit is meant to complement current inventorying methods. It can be used as another point on which current understandings of the landscape might be re-explored.
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1 ENCOUNTERS WITH LANDSCAPE

1.1 LIMINALITY IN LANDSCAPE

Landscape is a bewilderment. One that puzzles and disorientates, yet surprises. To engage landscape is to have encounters with it; of encounters within encounters; of encountering embedded associations within physical encounters.

Cultural geographer David Seamon writes of the interrelationship between people and the environment, where the manner of encounters affects the level of engagement, or separation between them (Seamon, A Geography of the Lifeworld: Movement, Rest and Encounter, 1979). Seamon explains perception as the way an observer relates to his environment, the process by which stimuli outside the person becomes signals. For Seamon, whose interests lie in the relationship between environment and people’s behaviour, a moment of encounter is “integrally related to other aspects of the moment, including mood, energy level, past experience and knowledge” (Seamon, A Geography of the Lifeworld: Movement, Rest and Encounter, 1979, p. 100).
One such encounter, to me, is on Rapaki Track, located on the Port Hills of Christchurch (See Figure 1). Its 'steepness' runs twofold. One is due to its volcanic origins, shaping its landforms. The other is its rootedness to historical associations. Having been used extensively as the key link between the city and Lyttelton Harbour (over the hills on the southern side of the plains), Rapaki Track is entrenched in cultural and social significance, with specific relevance to Maori connections, legend and symbolism (Summit Road Society, 2014). Currently designated, and heavily used as a recreational track, it forms a connection between the city and the Summit Road, becoming a part of a continuous link to the rest of the much-loved Christchurch’s Port Hills, and greater Banks Peninsula (Christchurch City Council, 2014).

Map of New Zealand (Showing location of enlarged area below)

Figure 1 Rapaki Track – Straddling the city and the harbour, and in-between urban and rural zonings (Image from Google Earth)
However, what to me is intriguing about Rapaki Track is its potential beyond the obvious, where a slight venturing off its beaten track can expose its myriad of relatively un-explored and hidden locales. Stretching more than three kilometres at a start point of almost a hundred metres above mean sea level, it rises to more than three hundred metres and is home to three distinctive ecosystems (Lucas, 1997). As a result, straddling accessible and well-used stretches are concealed pockets that exist as oases amongst the relatively open terrain. At its summit, large open spaces afford encounters that span thresholds between the city and the harbour, land and water, gradual to steep contours, agriculture and recreation, and city and rural. Collectively, these in-between spaces form a series of edges and limits. They become unique and dynamic zones with the existence of elements that exist on either side. Spaces that afford such encounters exude characteristics of being liminal; of bestriding. These are where one realm opens up without having the other closed, evoking an association of ‘liminality’. It is for this reason that the sense of the in-between becomes relevant, upon which the key questions of my research are developed. As will be explained in Chapter 3, the use of adjusted and expanded inventorying methods, each with specific tasks and techniques, have been applied along the entire stretch of Rapaki Track. This has resulted in the identification of five threshold points (Figure 2) that exhibited characteristics of being liminal. They are each found to be in unique locations, adjacent to starkly contrasting terrains and vegetation, and vary in the level of being enclosed from, or exposed to, the robust climatic conditions of the hills.

![Figure 2 Rapaki Track Plan and Section – Showing locations and terrain profile of identified Threshold Points](image)
Landscape theorist Jacky Bowring describes such opening up as a series of thresholds that offer in-between moments. Bowring describes these moments as instances when a range of points of contemplation opens out. In explaining the interplay between interior and exterior, Bowring argues that the “boundary between landscape and architecture is not a line, but a zone of liminality, an ontological realm…” (Bowring, 2004, p. 49). Such departures, ones that head towards reflective encounters beyond the physical realm, resonate with the writings of anthropologist Arnold Van Gennep. For Van Gennep, the concept of “territorial passage” indicates the crossing of thresholds (limen). He highlights that during rites of passage, a person becomes connected to different phases in life, through ceremonial (spatial encounters) or phases in life (temporal encounters) (Shields, 1991).

According to the anthropologist Victor Turner, van Gennep identifies three distinguishable stages; that of separation, margin or limen, and reaggregation in experiencing liminality. Applying such an understanding into landscapes might be a relevant concept to the designer. In the process of designing interventions, landscape’s thresholds could be conceptualised to foster a state of mind conducive for contemplating the spatio-temporal. This might lead to the employing of landscapes as a means to de-engage and re-engage encounters, and offer leaps into the realm of the metaphysical. For the designer, this could be useful in distinguishing such zones from the vastness of the environment.

It is the quality of being in the middle that enables things to become rich with possibilities. In particular, it is where the existence of the “middle” can only be made possible by the overlapping of its constituents. In the designing of settings, Donald Getz reiterates that the tangibles (setting, atmosphere and programme) should evoke the intangibles, where “meanings are attached to experiences” (Getz, 2012, p. 224). For Getz, who specialises in events design and management, the sense of uniqueness can be accomplished only through the experiential bridging of all associated components required in the designing of an event. As shown in Figure 3, Getz explains that the correlation between the three key components acts as the foundations for the creation of unique, satisfying and memorable experiences, of which setting is a part. This means that landscape can therefore take on the role of being a setting. Can the designing of interventions within landscapes, then make use of a more detailed and
thorough inventorying of these thresholds so that it contributes towards the creation of unique experiences, instead of focusing merely on visually-pleasing ‘perspectives’?

Figure 3 Getz’ Foundations of Event Design

Getz’s concept draws parallels with Edward Casey’s considerations of the duality of the in-between and edges. For philosopher Casey, they are active presences for one another, where edges act as bounds to the in-between. Casey, however, defines these ‘bounds’ not as entities that limit. Rather, they are akin to porous edges, ones that take in as well as give out. Here, the in-between can be read as “un-ending” (Casey, 2007, p. 6), one that suggests to the landscape designer the production of interventions that constantly engage the adjacent environment; of crossing thresholds and invoking experiences that are always in flux.

1.2 LIMINAL SPACES AND LIMINAL ELEMENTS

As Bowring (2004) explains, such crossings of thresholds act as a continuum of experience, where connections to other points of reference open up “to the discourse of the sublime, the subject and object of humans and landscape” (p. 52). Being in a liminal space, according to Bowring, is to be in a place “where things become intensified and condensed”; where they
are “the limen between the physical and the metaphysical” (Bowring, 2004, p.52). It can be argued that in the context of my research, this sense of going ‘beyond’ the physicality of the environment might be understood in four ways.

First is the designer’s own acknowledgement of his or her being in a liminal state of mind. As a person from the ‘outside’, the designer needs to be sufficiently immersed ‘inside’; of delving ‘into’ the site in any attempt to understand all its offerings and peculiarities. With knowledge and experience gained from the ‘outside’ world, the designer’s role is to achieve equilibrium of juxtaposing one over the other. Being in between, the designer’s understanding of the fine line between emic and etic considerations might make the difference towards a well-approached and well-executed process. For instance, the designer might need to do in-depth research of specific relationships and connections that are culturally or historically significant in attempting to delve into this ‘inside’.

A further opportunity relates to identifying liminal spaces in the landscape. Being aware of the existence of such spaces might enable the designer to extract the qualities that are specifically unique. In particular is the need to be conscious of the subtleties that such spaces are potentially rich in. Such intricacies could be drawn from adjacent areas that are characteristically distinct. Making such nuances explicit might evoke a sense of experience that is incomparable beyond these liminal spaces.

Third is the re-defining of landscape’s elements within liminal spaces, where awareness might be raised to inform certain characteristics of these elements. This is because such qualities are made apparent only when situated within such spaces. For example, the deliberate insertion of contrasting elements into a zone that spans those where each is found might elicit a consciousness of the contrasting properties each has. A work by the artist Andy Goldsworthy is shown as an example in Figure 4 below, where the sense of awareness becomes apparent as both elements each ‘claim’ an existence within the liminal space. In such an instance, the focus is on the capacity of the space as a liminal entity, and its affordance in allowing reflections into the sublime.
A fourth understanding is in the potential that is attained through the insertion of liminal elements into ‘non-liminal’ landscapes. Embedding them into designs might make such interventions richer as they inject a sense of the symbolic and the ephemeral. For instance, snow can be considered a naturally occurring liminal element. Its fleeting presence affords people a different engagement with the environment, while at the same time concealing the actual make-up of the landscape. It also gives hints of the atmospheric and weather conditions – a way of hinting through human’s
other sensorial apparatus. When snow melts, its status as a liminal entity disappears as it gets re-absorbed into the environment, either as water that flows on the land or vapour that fills the atmosphere. As this happens, it exposes what’s beneath; a sense of physical unravelling. At the same time, it starts to inhibit the very types of activities that it had recently just afforded. Such liminal elements exist in abundance naturally. Their physical states gradually morph as they adapt to seasonal changes.

However, will such elements be readily identifiable? If not, there might be a need to make the process of inventorying them during site analyses more specific. At this juncture, it is prudent to highlight the scholarly distinction between subject- and object-oriented concepts. Ontological considerations of ‘leaps’ beyond the physical might shed some light. Arguments on the concept of ‘atmospheres’, offered by philosopher Gernot Bohme (Bohme, 2013) and architectural academic Andreas Wesener (Wesener, 2014, pp. 134-140), are considered relevant. The snow example is taken further here. Being a non-man-made, but physical phenomenon, the presence, or the disappearance of snow creates a psychological effect. It allows for the grasping of the landscape, and its effects on the human psyche, through perhaps, the temperature, the ‘white-ness’ of light, the sense of fragility, even the sense of ‘freshness’ as it melts. Bohme’s and Andreas’ in-depth discussions, followed by the position taken within this research, will be expanded further in Section 2.2.2.

1.3 RELEVANCE OF THE CONCEPT OF IN-BETWEEN-NESS

Landscape theorist and practitioner James Corner considers such approaches, of quantifying and manifesting concepts into strategies, as critical. He considers that they are a kind of mapping. Arguing that such steps allow for the actualisation of certain possibilities, Corner (1999) states that the mapper’s act “of gathering, working, assembling, relating, revealing, sifting and speculating” (p. 219) unravels hidden meanings. Corner argues that the mapper’s immersion into the cartographic process is an important aspect as it engenders a sense of interaction for “new and meaningful relationships amongst otherwise disparate parts” (Corner, 1999, p. 219).
My research finds that in the process of referring to Corner’s position, the presence of the ‘mapper’ offers the potential of having another dimension added to the equation. As mentioned on page 5, the landscape architect is a researcher who is in a liminal state. Being in the discipline, the landscape architect is an immersive participant, yet at the same time a distant observer, being unfamiliar with the site. This blurring of roles might be positively capitalised as a means to ‘see’ things anew. Equipped with a systematic set of tools to analyse, the designer’s ‘re-interpretations’ of the site could be that nudge that opens up new experiences. Harnessing elements specific to the site might enrich and enliven such interventions, ones that respond to the genius loci. This is where a specific method of inventorying liminal qualities that are unique to each site could be a valuable tool for the designer: it is this possibility that forms the key focus of my research.

1.4 WHY THE NEED TO BE DIFFERENT?

Architectural theorist Botond Bognar, in stating the need for a holistic understanding of investigative collation during the pre-design stage, writes that in an attempt to experience and interpret the environment anew, the designer needs to constantly vary his or her viewpoints between “observers and observed” (Bognar, 1985, p. 192). This attempt is what Corner terms as a disclosure, the staging and even the adding of the potential for later acts and events to unfold, providing a “generative means” or acting as a “suggestive vehicle” (Corner, 1999, p. 219). Corner (1999) adds that the drawing out of new and latent relationships can produce “insights that have both utility and metaphoricity” (p. 219). Such assertions reiterate the researcher’s liminal position, where the need to be dynamic and be open to seek out opportunities on either side of the fence is paramount. The researcher needs to be constantly aware of the ever-changing and ever-evolving nature of interactions between people and landscapes, of which liminal spaces have been established to be overtly rich with.

Parallel to Bowring’s concept of the crossings of thresholds as a continuum of experience is landscape academic Catherine Howett’s position. Howett, in citing Lawrence Halprin, states that the awareness of the environment is a
“totality continuous with the participant” (Howett, 2002, p. 116). She contends that the researcher, who at the same time is a participant, needs to understand environmental psychology, defined as the relationships humans have with the environment. Howett suggests that this can be carried out by analysing the nature of human place experience. This, in turn, according to Howett, is where a new landscape aesthetic might be framed.

Perhaps such ‘framing’ could be those that are not literally translated. Instead, this is where landscapes can be ‘prompted’ to communicate values shared by cultures through the ‘framing of’, or the focusing of these human place experiences. Can such relaying of values be instances where one is led to, according to Howett (2002), the discovery of meanings that becomes “part of our aesthetic response to the places we inhabit or encounter” (p. 116)? If so, this reinforces the need for specific strategies in inventorying such experiences.

My research seeks to explore the possibilities where inventoried liminal landscapes might in turn prompt the landscape architect to design interventions that could forge a new sense of engagement between people and the landscape. One possibility could be through the use of elements within landscapes. In provoking the ‘experiencer’ for responses, the designs might become a narrative backdrop, acting merely as prompts. This is where each ‘experiencer’, being in a liminal position, discovers the juxtapositions between landscape and ‘the designed’; between elements and artefacts, and in the process, scripts his or her own encounters.

This idea runs parallel to the concepts put forward by landscape architecture academic Matthew Potteiger and landscape architecture practitioner Jamie Purinton. In explaining the role played by landscape narratives as a means of making landscapes, Potteiger and Purinton describe “open narratives” as more than just a backdrop; they are where places become “eventful changing sites that engender stories” (Potteiger & Purinton, 2002, p. 136). It is their focus on ‘multiple authors’, of which the designer and the eventual ‘experiencer’ are amongst, that has resonance to my research. According to Potteiger and Purinton, narratives can be taken to already exist implicitly in landscapes, inscribed by natural processes.
and cultural practices. This is where specific lines of inventorying could play a role in unravelling them. These un-covered narratives could, in turn, be used as insertions in designs that are just enough to instil curiosity, leading to more engaged and in-depth encounters with the landscape. Designs, being in between people and the environment, could then be used to heighten the awareness of landscape’s embedded associations in such encounters.

In order to ascertain the relevance of these liminal spaces in generating richer encounters in landscapes, the task might be to seek strategies that can be applied to conceive such experiences. Prior to that, however, the ability to first identify these liminal spaces within the vastness of landscape needs to be addressed.

This is where my research delves into the potential that liminal or ‘in-between’ spaces could create in affording richer experiences of landscape - both physically and metaphysically. This research question further as to whether or not, it is possible to first identify such spaces. This question leads to the examining and testing of specific strategies and methods that might be needed to methodically inventory these spaces.

These lines of inquiry could be important strategies that are in line with explored concepts of the key research questions, shaping the landscape architect’s thinking process. This might, in turn, directly influence how interventions are designed. In short, how can these insights be more tangible for me? This question resides next to the core questions of my research.

The focus and strategy of this research, as outlined in Figure 5 below, are therefore to identify key qualities in liminal landscapes. To do so, a set of methods is used. During that process, it is recognised that the current and sensible inventorying techniques are not capable of capturing and extracting the essence of these intangible, invisible or hidden characteristics of landscapes. A more comprehensive set of methods, with tasks and techniques adjusted and added, is needed for a more detailed and holistic
way of inventorying these characteristics, which are both explicit and lay hidden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</th>
<th>METHODS &amp; TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Define what is meant by ‘liminal landscapes’</td>
<td>• Discuss theories and thoughts that could be used as guides in the unravelling of these characteristics</td>
<td>• Connect the theoretical framework to practical approaches</td>
<td>• Explain how these adjustments and additions could act as a set of tools to assist the landscape designer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss how these characteristics could potentially, in turn, ‘un-familiarise’ settings, thus ‘de-familiarising’ familiar activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>○ in identifying liminal characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ in inventorying liminal spaces &amp; associated liminal elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ By acting as prompts in the designing of interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Illustrate how these tools are applied onto study sites to prompt the designing of interventions that forge a new or a deeper sense of engagement between people and the landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 Research Focus and Strategy

1.5 RESEARCH AND THESIS STRUCTURE

In light of the broad considerations, a structure of the research and thesis needed to be determined (Figure 6). It sets the flow on which the investigations are to be carried out. It ensures that key stages are interlinked, from its inception stage that highlights the focus of the research, right through to the expected outcome. Setting the framework for the research, the structure also ensures that any literature analysed within the theoretical framework could potentially be translated into practical strategies, en route to having the core questions answered. Such translations could result in the designing of interventions that could foster a new or a deeper sense of engagement between people and the landscape. They can be considered as the guiding ‘hands’ from which familiar landscapes could be transformed into ‘new’ or ‘un-familiar’ settings. These ‘freshly perceived’ settings could, in turn, be filled with potentials to ‘de-familiarise’ familiar activities, creating a renewed sense of engagement, perhaps even participatory, between humans and their land.
Based on this premise, the resulting structure has determined four key terms, each with its own set of targeted literature review, on which the concept of liminality in landscapes could be examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>POTENTIAL OF LIMINAL LANDSCAPES (KEY TERMS)</th>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>TOOLKIT DEVELOPMENT &amp; CONCLUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(CHAPTER 1)</td>
<td>(CHAPTER 2)</td>
<td>(CHAPTER 3)</td>
<td>(CHAPTERS 4 &amp; 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
Potential of liminal or 'in-between' spaces to create richer experiences of landscape - both physically and metaphysically

**ASSOCIATED**
1) Is it possible to develop a typology of such experiences?
2) Is it possible to develop an associated methodology for inventorying them, so these can be explicitly identified and recorded?

**PHYSICAL LANDSCAPES**
- The Geographical World
  - As an Active Setting
  - The Make-up
    - Of Network & Meshwork
  - Edges

**LIMINAL LANDSCAPES**
- Concept of liminality and its Connection to Experience
- Liminal Spaces in Landscape
- Liminal Elements in Landscape

**METAPHYSICAL LANDSCAPES**
- Of Transcending Physical Matter
- Of Immediacy of Experience
- Of Projection
  (Correlation of Past, Present and Future)

**LANDSCAPE EXPERIENCE**
- Perception of Landscape
- Embodiment into Landscape
- Describing Landscape

**INVENTORYING**
- Determining Specific Study Sites (Using Initial Inventorying Methods)
- Analysing the Methods (Reference to Key Concepts)
- Adjusting and Expanding Inventorying Methods
- Identifying Threshold Points

**TOOLKIT DEVELOPMENT**
- Identifying Gap in the Discipline (Between Theory & Practice)
- Adjustment to Research Sequence
- Toolkit (Method Cards)

**CONCLUSION**
- Significance of Research

**KEY CONCEPTS FOR THE RESEARCH**
- Perception
- Journeying in
- Embodiment
- "Authentic Wholeness"
- "Descriptive Hermeneutics"
- Projection

![Figure 6 Research and Thesis Structure](image)

These terms, discussing the potential of liminal landscapes (Chapter 2), have led to the distilling of six key concepts. These concepts, in turn, are used to frame a set of methods, each with its own set of tasks and techniques, that have been specifically focused towards the inventorying of liminal qualities in landscapes. Tested on case studies, which are tabulated in Chapter 3, lessons learnt are then used to refine the methods. This led to the development of a toolkit (Chapter 4) that is meant to systematically organise the inventorying processes of identifying liminal spaces and liminal qualities in landscapes.

Concluding discussions in Chapter 5 summarise the possibilities of how findings from this research might contribute to the discipline, in particular the
development of a prototype toolkit that could specifically tease out landscape’s intangible, invisible and hidden characteristics. This toolkit could potentially also double as a set of prompts for the landscape designer to design interventions that could forge a new or a deeper sense of engagement between people and the landscape.

To maintain the tightness of this thesis, its focus has been more on the generation of the prototype toolkit. The research, however, has gone one step further by using the identified characteristics as design prompts in the conceptualising of interventions for each of the case study sites. The designs act as a means of testing the possibilities of these qualities in transforming the current state or ‘familiar’ landscapes into ‘new’ or ‘un-familiar’ settings. They are then assessed in their capabilities of creating ‘freshly perceived’ settings, and thereon, examined further in their ability to create a renewed sense of engagement within each site. As this next stage, of designing and testing its outcome, is not the focus of this thesis, and is thus not expressly detailed in this thesis, it is attached only as a source of reference in the Appendices.
In the previous chapter, a case for the relevance of the research questions and key concepts was introduced and explained.

The key question considers the potential of liminal or 'in-between' spaces to create richer experiences of landscape - both physically and metaphorically. Supporting this, associated questions have also been identified that consider first, if it is possible to develop a typology of such experiences, and second, an associated methodology for inventorying them, so these can be explicitly identified and recorded. Before examining my research question as a whole it is necessary to tease out the key terms contained within. The following four sections consider, from the researched literature, key definitions and theoretical positions relevant to the following terms: physical landscapes; liminal or 'in-between' landscapes; metaphysical landscapes; and landscape experience. As mentioned on page 12, the extracted essence of each term provides the key concepts of my research.
2.1 PHYSICAL LANDSCAPES

For Donald Meinig, a cultural geographer whose interests includes the interpretation of landscapes, physical landscapes generally relate to the setting or conditions in which a particular activity is carried out (Meinig, 1979) and as, according to phenomenologist and geographer Yi-Fu Tuan, the spaces in which people act (Tuan, 1979). My research has sought to examine dimensions of physical landscapes from three approaches, discussed in Section 2.1.1 through Section 2.1.3.

2.1.1 The Geographical World – As an Active Setting

Considered as a setting in which activities are carried out, landscape creates affordances that alter according to the way it is perceived (Meinig, 1979a). In highlighting the subjectivity of perception to which readings of landscapes are acquired, Meinig relates it to the complexity of having to first define what landscapes actually are. For example, what is seen by one as a visual sense of awe might be interpreted by another as a reminder of a historically rich encounter that one’s forefathers had taken part in. What is considered as a place to site a home might instead be perceived by another as a place that must be kept preserved or untouched in order to maintain habitats that house rich ecological biodiversity. David Seamon, who researches the relationship between environment and behaviour, argues that these subjective levels of perception are where “stimuli outside the person become signals” (Seamon, A Geography of the Lifeworld: Movement, Rest and Encounter, 1979, p. 100). Seamon explains that these signals depend on the varying degrees of information available, of which the environment is a source.

Seamon (1979) explains the correlation between these signals with “human being’s inescapable immersion of day-to-day experiences in the geographical world” (p. 15). Such physical locales are the place where human activities occur, and where activities and environment influence each other. Just as a stage set is designed to create distinct ambience, the landscape could take on an instrumental role. The resulting engagement, one that merges the ‘stage’ with the activities ‘performed’ on it, and with the ‘performers’, elicits a unique expression of the place. Following
Seamon’s position, landscape and the environment can be considered as an active setting that participates in many ways. In this vein, James Corner calls for the realignment of approaches in landscape architectural designing. Corner (1999a) highlights the opportunity to emphasise the experiential intimacies of engagement, participation, and use over time as a way to redefine what a setting could be. This sense of participatory landscapes, where activities both act on the landscape, and are a response to the landscape, raises an important question regarding the potential that physical landscape could play in landscape architectural designs: how can landscapes be better understood beyond the dimension of their physical space?

This dynamic and vigorous participation between the physical structures (forms of the landscape) and the activities (actions performed on the landscape) shapes such a close relationship that social scientist Janet Stephenson calls it a bond; something which is uniquely spatial and subjected to differing perceptions (Stephenson, 2010). This bond is developed from a familiarity with the landscape, either through repeated encounters by the visitor, or from constant engagement and lived-in experiences of the occupant. Seamon refers to this sense of familiarity as a form of “place ballet” (Seamon, A Geography of the Lifeworld: Movement, Rest and Encounter, 1979, p. 54), where recurring activities conducted within a familiar space become second-nature.

As one’s body moves along the journey to a destination, such recurrences in turn generate what Corner terms an “eidetic experience” (Corner, 1999a, p. 153), where mental conceptions become translated as multi-sensorial experiences in the landscape. When this happens, the experiences become embedded in one’s memory. The capacity of landscapes to afford these multi-sensory exposures presents a potential to provide opportunities for the designing of interventions, where inserting activities unfamiliar to the setting might create dynamic interactions between people and the environment. In a way, it is akin to inserting a liminal element as a means to alter perceived expectations. In terms of my research, the focus is whether or not such interventions can be designed to purposely disrupt this ‘place ballet’ and create the unexpected within the expected. This, in turn,
might shift how a setting, afforded physically by the landscape, is understood.

For the landscape architect, in order to inject these informed interventions, it is necessary to first identify and record the ‘usual’ happenings within these ‘usual’ settings. From this, and through iterative and in-depth inventorying, elements that are beyond these ‘normal’ occurrences, but are still afforded by the physicality of landscapes might be considered. One way is to treat landscapes as a field of possibilities. Architect Stan Allen, referring to this ground-up approach of re-defining settings as a “dynamic field condition” (Allen, 1999, p. 2), considers the possibility of interconnectivity as a way to express these unravelled elements into new forms that focus on the relationship between elements. It is the acknowledgement of existence, followed by the seeking out of relationships within and between these elements, of which setting is a part. The relationships referred to here are activities and meanings beyond the physical, but afforded nonetheless by it. These include those that are beyond what can be perceived solely by visual means. This concept of landscape as a field of opportunities is considered important as a form of ‘journey-ing in’ into the landscape, and has led to the formation the key concepts of my research, as consolidated in Section 2.5.

Landscape architect Richard Weller considers a design approach based on elements beyond the physical as a means to develop structurally relevant time developmental strategies, referring to these elements as “alternative cultural relationships with the earth” (Weller, 2001, p. 21). The relevance to this research is the amalgamation of physical landscapes with the layers of workings and meanings that are embedded within them. Stephenson (2010) explains these amalgamations as fresh or renewed engagements that still acknowledge evolving relationships between people and place can be realised. Therefore, dynamic inventorying of physical landscapes that are read in tandem with temporal effects can be used to understand the shifts and modifications of sites-in-time, which architect Georges Descombes considers as a means to realise future potentials (Descombes, 1999). From the context of my research, this ever-changing nature that the physical landscape presents itself could be a way to continuously and constantly
unfold new relationships. For example, interventions might be designed to constantly evolve with seasonal changes.

Tuan considers approaching the design of landscapes at an encompassing and multi-layered level as an important strategy, as designed environments have a direct impact on human senses and feelings. This is where, according to Tuan, the landscape encourages us to dream. At the same time, it grounds us through its physicality. It does this with its components that can be seen and touched (Tuan, 1979). The richness of these strata, when juxtaposed to serve as design prompts, is where this research considers could be important opportunities to craft interventions that offer open-ended permutations. These variations, in terms of adaptability of the settings, and of creating spatiotemporal relationships could act as building blocks that create diverse experiential encounters with, and within physical landscapes. This is one of the key questions that my research seeks to respond to. One possible way is to examine how a landscape might be re-looked and re-read, so that those characteristics beyond the ‘usual’ are also considered, akin to Corner’s prospect of recovering landscape as a means of opening up and realising “landscape’s hidden meanings and potentials” (Corner, 1999b, p. ix).

This section has examined the overarching potentials of landscape’s physicality, of which the sense of interrelating, be it in the form of overlaid hidden meanings or in the interlocking of physical spaces from the ground up with ‘renewed’ activities, might be a useful design strategy. This strategy might be a way of dousing the desire to focus solely on the landscape’s visually-appealing characteristics. The examination has acknowledged that to support such a strategy, there needs to be a refinement to the process of inventorying. In order to understand how such fine-tuning can be carried out, it is useful to unpack the differences between the understanding of perceptibility and imperceptibility in the landscape.

2.1.2  The Make-up – Of Network and Meshwork

This section identifies relevance in the concept of heightening the awareness of differences between these tangible realities and the
intangibility of nuanced meanings. When layered onto readings of landscapes, they become understood as amalgamated entities, upon which possibilities to understand landscapes as more than scenery are opened up. This overlaying becomes a means of unlocking potentials that would allow the landscape to be understood beyond being mere objects in the environment, and unravel rich insights into its other qualities (Ruru, Stephenson, & Abbott, 2010).

The intimacy and intricacy of lines in nature have been described by anthropologist Tim Ingold as points of intersections and connections. For Ingold, actual physical lines and folds, of which the environment is comprised, are set against the backdrop of perceptions and meanings they hold. He defines these as storylines and narrated plots (Ingold, 2007). Distinctly termed as meshwork and network, where the former is defined as lines of movement and growth, and the latter as lines of construct, Ingold’s position offers a potential framework for the analysis of landscapes. Ingold explains that by taking the form of physical boundaries and trails that crisscross the terrain, networks act as lines that lead to destinations, join other trails at intersections, carry people through, and connect points.

Meshwork on the other hand, are the stories behind them; those intermingled narratives that tell the tales behind the formation of the trails, creating an awareness of the past. The legacy of the people behind the making of these trails can be taken as an example, in particular the stories that record their negotiations and interactions with the terrain. Another example is where a certain geological phenomenon, lying embedded within a nearby cave and otherwise remaining untold to the passer-by, can instead be revealed, adding another dimension to its presence. How these characteristics might be used as design prompts, points to yet another direction in which this research is headed. Though having to be revealingly detailed, any attempt to inventory, and reveal these essences needs to remain simple, or as Corner calls it, “laconic and communicable” (Corner, 1999a, p. 161). This is to ensure that when read with the physicality of landscapes, these extracted meanings can be easily understood and grasped.
Meinig (1979) considers change as the only constant in landscapes. In his essay “The Beholding Eye”, Meinig states that landscape is a panorama that continually changes as one moves along. To him, landscape is a part of the environment that is defined by vision and interpreted by the mind. It can be argued in this research, however, that this concept of change and constant re-reading should include landscape’s physical state, and how they are interpreted. Given this, adopting meshwork as a way to inform thoughts for future interpretations is, as determined by cultural geographer David Lowenthal, essential to maintain a sense of continuity (Lowenthal, 1979). Suggesting that from knowledge of the past comes the possibility of new interpretations, Lowenthal’s position is one that reiterates the continually changing nature of the present, and of landscapes. This dynamism; one that constantly seeks new responses, is where richer experiences of landscape can potentially be highlighted through designs. As such, fresh responses and interpretations might be evoked from people who are new to a particular landscape.

Ruru, Stephenson, & Abbott (2010) stress the additional power that landscape possesses in acting as prompts, responding to its interactions with people, referring to Bowring’s argument of landscape’s capacity to “remember” (Bowring, 2010, p. 91). These juxtapositions can be considered as an overarching potential, where the crafting of a typology of experiences can become a point of departure from mere visual inventorying of landscape’s physical elements. A key part of my research seeks to identify and propose an alternative way to have such stories identified and highlighted within the inventorying stage of a design process. Instead of existing separately, or having one entity hidden from the other, these integrated overlays of landscape’s physical network and meshwork of meanings might allow for the embracing of landscapes as part of human existence. This line of argument resonates with Tuan’s belief that the “designed environment has a direct impact on human senses and feelings” (Tuan, 1979, p. 99). This positions landscape in a more central role, rather than remaining a static site for artefacts like built forms, diminished as leftover spaces, or considered the fringe area of human habitation and engagement.
In the context of my research, these overlays are envisaged to potentially play two key metaphorical roles. The first lies in landscape’s capacity to relay a symbolic meaning. Incorporating the quest for historical and cultural connections into the process of inventorying, the landscape architect can extract memorable experiences within a particular site. Being site specific, these recollections would give hints that can induce ideas of engaging the landscape from new positions. As designer and architectural academic Frances Downing explains, symbolic meaning is an expression of life, where the significance of a memorable place experience lies in “the ideas of feeling” (Downing, 2000, p. 11), rather than the actual feeling itself. These ideas, reiterates Downing, can be considered as the essence that presents meaning to designers, providing the much-needed stimulus in crafting new engagements with the landscape. For example, a track that has historically been a physical connector between two different settlements can be re-interpreted as one that links two distinct bioregions; bioregions that bear characteristics of vegetation that were once, and still are significant to those same settlements. Though the memories are somewhat altered, they might still be made to evoke past references. This sense of landscape playing a symbolic role is considered an important aspect in the formation of the key concepts of my research as a means of ‘projection’, as its relevance is correlated in Section 2.5.

This potential has a second symbolic role in what Richard Weller terms as “reconstruction” (Weller, 2001, p. 9). Discussing Corner, Weller relates the agency of metaphor as a means of connecting relations. He explains Corner’s concept of ‘signifier and signified’, and of bridging their commonalities, where as a metaphorical means of extrapolating new meanings, relationships that have remained dormant can be unveiled. This presents an opportunity to overlay landscape’s physicality with its hidden meanings in order to create richer experiences of the landscape. For instance, in a place of remembrance designed to encapsulate the enormity of a disaster, the use of physical cues can act as ley lines that connect the commemorative place to the actual sites of the event. This gesture can be read as a symbolic bridge, emphasising the magnitude of the event by becoming the point where these physical lines converge. Such representations can also act as platforms to encourage psychological and emotional departures beyond the remembering. This explanation gives an
indication as to how landscapes might play an important and unique role in affording such encouragements.

This opens up another set of possibilities; one that questions if a methodology to inventory it, could be created. Inventoring and designing are part of one process; one that changes how a landscape designer approaches a project as they peel back hidden meanings layer by layer. The mapping of stories, of various perspectives carried by people of different cultural backgrounds can create a rich tapestry of insights. For example, a walking track, interjected with relevant narratives, might no longer feel like a physical ‘pass-through’, like a network. Rather, it becomes a ‘walk-into’, taking the form of a meshwork. Such multi-layered readings can begin to shape the designer’s feel for the place well before any conceptualisation begins. These interactions; of the designer and the site, and of people and the environment, would place both entities as existing with, and for each other; each enfolding within the other. As Corner states, the all-inclusive progression of collecting, assembling, and interrelating data is considered a creative process (Corner, 1999c), something that my research focuses on.

Having established the importance of landscape’s ability to potentially accommodate and spur such embarkations, the question is whether or not ‘meshwork’ can be inventoried? And if so, how does the inventoring take place? Unlike ‘network’, where the focus is more on the physicality of landscapes, ‘meshwork’ concerns the intangible. This sense of duality; of contrasting attributes and capacity is discussed in further detail in the next section.

2.1.3 Edges

It is now useful to consider the ways of how edges are defined, given that landscape is a canvas made up of layers, both in the form of the real and the abstract. The concept of network and meshwork (Ingold, 2007) referred to in Section 2.1.2 might be used to explain how an edge, which is formed by lines, functions as a boundary. Understanding this role might point to a second emphasis on the distinct status of spaces on its either sides. Landscapes, especially those designed, have been known to be established
as a series of distinct ‘territories’, within which, only certain activities are allowed to occur. Take, for instance, a playing field. Acting as a setting on which different games can be held concurrently, each with its own edges and lines of demarcation, the field is nevertheless a seamless ground. The white line markings serve as boundaries that are strictly adhered to even though they are no more physical in nature than thin strips of dried paint. They delineate, yet are permeable, similar in vein as Edward Casey’s concepts of “Salient Edge” and “Subtle Edge” (Casey, 2007, p. 91). Casey identifies these as two extremes where the former is an edge that announces itself; one that defines physical boundaries, with the latter being one that is “ambiguous in appearance” like the fabric folds and the horizon in the distant landscape. For philosopher Casey, these emphases define the sense of enclosures and boundaries, where they begin to become indiscernible at their extremes. Taking Casey’s position as a prompt, designing for experiences at such imperceptible edges might become important and interesting, creating more engaging encounters; even thought-provoking. This runs parallel to how the phenomenological philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty explains the concept of space as a means of positioning of things. Merleau-Ponty argues that this approach indirectly stimulates inter-connectivity, contrary to Kant’s position of drawing “a strict demarcation line between space as the form of external experience and the things given within that experience” (Merleau-Ponty, 1945, p. 283).

This apparent merging of landscape’s ‘ground’ with its ‘figure’, like drawn boundary lines, presents further potentials when adopted as design strategies. This is because intensification of interrelationships occurs during such integrations. Though lines may be drawn to separate and dissect, and may manifest physically, or as symbolic or metaphysical inferences, they inevitably form edges. Due to the permeable nature of these edges, they in turn, provide open-ended opportunities as un-broken and un-interrupted spaces. This is in line with what Elizabeth Meyer describes as “spatial continuum that unites”. These expanded fields, as shown in Figure 7 below, are defined by Meyer as concepts that could create possibilities of forging “complex, not simple, relationships to one another” (Meyer, 1997, p. 167). Meyer calls for the need to go beyond binary relationships, like between
Meyer proposes concepts like figured ground, articulated space, the minimal garden, and landscapes for architecture. These newly-coined terms are meant to describe relationships as being more than just binary; of being “complex, not simple, relationships to one another” (p. 169).

Expanding concepts to ones that go beyond a single, clear-cut description, Meyer argues that such an approach could redefine that “solid line that divides” (p. 167). For example, instead of “landscape”, a more dynamic term might be “landscape-field”. These interrelationships and formations, where distinct categories on adjacent sides of edges are no longer clear-cut, could be considered as potentials in inserting new possibilities into landscapes. This research finds this concept of mergence as a form of embodiment, and considers it as a relevant dimension on which key concepts of the research (compiled in Section 2.5) might be based.

Figure 7 Elizabeth Meyer’s adapted version of an expanded field for landscape architecture, derived from Krauss’ “Sculpture in the expanded field” (After Rosalind Krauss and Elizabeth Meyer)

These possibilities present a potential to re-set existing perceptions of the spaces within landscapes. By re-aligning these spaces with their other intrinsic but less noticeable characteristics, and of engaging their ‘ground”
with ‘figure’, new levels of engagement can be created, stimulating new found relationships. Allen’s concept of redefining the field as a dynamic condition might be used as an example, where finding relevance in Barry Le Va’s works on dissolving ‘sculptures’, Allen considers it as “a delimited entity, an object distinct from the field it occupies” (Allen, 1999, p. 6).

It can therefore be argued that though an enclosure needs to be defined by a boundary, a boundary or an edge does not necessarily always enclose. This fraying of edges further blurs boundaries, and dissolves ‘figures’. Compared to delineating entities and letting landscapes remain mere displays to be awed at or to be kept pristine in, such fraying might be a possible alternative design strategy. This strategy could, in turn, be a means where clear, distinct zones between landscapes are deliberately softened to create melded entities. As a result, new and immersive encounters could be created. For example, letting people and activities cross boundaries, indirectly ‘re-shaping’ the landscape, like forming meandering new routes away from prepared paths, a more dynamic relationship between landscape and its users might be created. A permeable boundary can lure people to come into a relationship with it. This de-emphasizing of boundary’s clear lines therefore might be used in designs as a means to encourage the crossing of perceived and visual thresholds.

How can landscape, then play a part in enabling these interactions? One possible way is to design a programme that includes its projections or evolution through time, the experiencing of landscape as it evolves, rather than only when it has been completed. Another way is to inject strategies that encourage user interventions as landscapes change, allowing a mere space in the landscape to be ‘re-claimed’ by the user. My research explores the possibility of creating such insertions. To do so, however, these ‘changes’, which are specific to each site might need to first be identified and understood.

The experiencing of space is closely linked to the temporal dimension. As argued by sociologist Rob Shields, “(U)nderstandings and concepts of space cannot be divorced from the real fabric of how people live their lives” (Shields, 1991, p. 7). For Shields, whose research focuses on relationships of
spatial forms with social activities and material things, spaces within landscapes are never simply locations. They are places with cultural contexts that add "a socially constructed level of meaning to the genius loci...said to derive from the forms of the physical environment in a given site" (Shields, 1991, p. 6). Understanding that spaces carry more meanings than being just a physical space, therefore, creates a potential that might be significant as a means of generating fresh or new meanings into spaces in landscapes. Such re-definitions might be achieved through new or unfamiliar interactions. These meanings, interpreted differently by each passing person, might again be that liminal injection within a design intervention, transforming the landscape into a dynamic space in which to have experiences.

The physical form of an edge might open another level of affordance. Lines, earlier defined as strips, can instead come in the form of meandering zones and spaces that lie ‘un-attended’ in urban fabrics. Considered uncertain, imprecise or unbounded, these interstitial spaces or terrains vagues, carry what Krystallia Kamvasinou describes as having both negative and positive connotations (Kamvasinou, 2006). Kamvasinou, who focuses on transitional landscapes on the urban periphery, argues that the terrain vague presents opportunities as a new type of public space. She cites Michel Desvigne’s terminology of “Intermediate Landscapes” to highlight the potential in filling these vacant spaces up without having to build on them, reiterating the importance of retaining emptiness as open spaces within the city. Can subtle insertions of design then be used as a means of connecting ‘abandoned’ spaces to urban frameworks, as a means of recovering their potentials in re-engaging people? Kamvasinou’s position offers clues for the re-defining of such terrains vagues.

Interstitial edge-spaces all have their own unique form and corresponding characteristics, whether as leftover swathes of land or in a city’s sprouting of vacant spaces, and can present rich opportunities. These edge-spaces can be where the spilling over of activities from one zone to the other, potentially sow the seeds for fertile exchanges and the dynamic formation of new interactions and usages for these zones. Karl Kullmann, whose interest is in linear parks in post-infrastructural sites, calls this a “positive instability, both
spatially and temporally”, arguing that “an edge can be evoked in the positive sense of a transition, threshold, or activity corridor” (Kullmann, 2011, p. 70). He considers the rupturing of edges, in particular to the typology of elongated landscapes, as possibilities towards creating fresh perception and understanding of these interstitial edge-spaces. He argues further that it is at these ruptured edges that spaces become ‘thickened’ with dynamism.

It can therefore be argued that linear edges, instead of being allowed to remain as wasted, un-characterised and marginalised leftover spaces, can act as the threads that physically weave and sew areas and zones. For the designer, this can act as a means of attracting multi-disciplinary creative inputs. Landscape architecture might take a central role not only in highlighting these opportunities, but to also direct the planning that interlaces such zones. A robust ecological strategy provides an analogy, where patches and corridors act as a means of engaging adjacent ecotones while still allowing spaces between and adjacent to these corridors to function as breathing lungs. The analogy highlights the concept of balancing the need for engaging various interest groups.

Ruptured edges, spaces and zones can function as a semi-permeable membrane. This allows for selective editing, and acts as a filter that may not necessarily change the form of activities, but alters the way these activities are engaged within landscapes. This is where landscapes could create affordances for activities to get adapted or hybridised. While remaining as a conduit, landscapes could slow things down, allowing time for these hybridisations to occur and evolve. During such processes the ‘physical width’ of these terrains vagues could be highlighted.

This section, together with the preceding two, highlights the three key approaches used in analysing the physicality of landscapes. Based on the belief that the physical landscape has more to offer than its ‘object-ive’ presence, these approaches reiterate the need to have a ‘re-look’ at landscapes by ‘look-ing’ beyond the scenes, and beyond the obvious.
This section also highlights the importance of first defining the palpability of landscapes. The next two sections explore the capacity of landscape to act as a medium that conveys embedded meanings. Landscape has the power to provide cues to divine presence through encounters that range from the sensing of transcendence to the grasping of immanence. The contemplation of the sublime becomes a revelatory and relevant connection to the corporeality of the environment. These potentials are now explored further.

2.2 LIMINAL LANDSCAPES

The concept of liminal landscapes is one that reveals potentials of in-between spaces. Through a series of edges and limits, the sense of being neither here nor there opens up possibilities of encountering richer experiences, both physically and metaphysically. It is therefore crucial to first examine the concept of liminality, and how it fits into the framework of my research.

2.2.1 Concept of Liminality and its Connection to Experience

The concept of liminality was introduced in 1909 by ethnologist Arnold Van Gennep in his Les rites de passage (The Rites of Passage). It refers to the state of “in-between-ness” where during such rites one goes through different phases of experiences. Interpreted as a tripartite sequence in ritual observance, starting with a state of separation, followed by being in a transition, to the eventual experiencing of re-incorporation, it focuses on the sense of disorientation. This sense of uncertainty provides the frame for how liminal spaces present the possibility for experiencing landscapes beyond the physical.

Van Gennep’s concept was developed further by the anthropologist Victor Turner, who highlights the crucial role played by symbolism in extending meanings to particular places. For Turner, the different participatory connections of experiences, as one goes through the three phases, is key. His analysis expands the nature and relationship of signs in language by
comparing the three branches of semiotics, where Turner believes that the
describing of the importance of “verbal and non-verbal symbols” (Turner,
1974, p. 53) in meaning-making is influenced by sociocultural processes and
settings. Of relevance to my research is the understanding of semantics,
where signs and symbols enter a relationship with the entities they refer to.
Such an emphasis, where referential meanings are expected to create a
sense of liminality, might point towards a ‘deeper’ understanding of
landscape.

Figure 8 Contrasting elements act as a reminder of the one another’s presence, and
of the onset of ephemeral dimensions within the landscape
(Image from Hill, 2007, p. 105)

One possible outcome might be the designer’s focus on extracting the
essence of these places and elements. This may lead to designs that are
more symbolic and appear as representations of these hidden meanings,
resulting in more abstract interventions, rather than literal translations or
‘direct placement’ of objects. For instance, as a form of environmental art
installation, the unique characteristics of the bright red hues of autumn leaves, hinting at the onset of a new season, might be accentuated when deliberately placed as a patterned design on a contrasting damp, dark grey rock. As shown in Figure 8 above, this abstract placement, of an element that lay in abundance elsewhere and that would otherwise exist in a fairly open, sun-drenched space, onto another that is entrenched in a damp and dark adjacent space, might immediately evoke recollections of the past juxtaposed onto the present. The soon-to-be-falling leaves, an object, ‘tell the tale’ of a passing season, a subject. The former is one that is gradually being deprived of sunlight, while the dampness of the rock ‘engages the experiencer in a conversation’ of an on-going story that highlights the lack of it.

At this juncture, a discussion of the concept of ‘atmospheres’ is necessary. As briefly introduced in Section 1.2, it distinguishes between subject- and object-oriented approaches in achieving perceptions that ‘goes beyond’ the physical.

For philosopher Gernot Bohme, ‘atmosphere’ is a space “of mindful physical presence” (Bohme, 2013, p. 21), one that is experienced through the bodily senses. It is a spatial experience, and is distinct from “bodies” (p. 21), such as interventions, which he considers as “bodily existence” (p. 21). Bohme argues that though both are specifically unique in nature, they are inevitably interlinked, and that an interplay between them would create a richer sense of spatial appreciation. One way, Bohme suggests, is to design an intervention that is not a focus in itself, but rather, as a spatial structure that can be experienced by the body. In other words, the focus of designs should not just be about physical entities per se, but to also be about the designing of space. In order to achieve that, design elements could be both corporeal and non-corporeal in nature. For instance, in the example shown in Figure 8 above, the presence of the leaves (objects) also exudes a ‘subject-ive’ sensitivity towards the effects caused by the passing season (subject). Interventions can, thus, be considered as generators of atmospheres. In turn, reiterates Bohme, atmospheres become a way towards a “mindful physical presence” (Bohme, 2013, p. 31) in space.
Bohme’s position is echoed by architectural and landscape architectural academic Andreas Wesener, who distinguishes atmosphere, as “aura” or “ambiance”, from “character” or “material characteristics” (Wesener, 2014, pp. 134-138). Categorising them as subject- and object-oriented concepts respectively, Wesener (2014) describes the former as one that is felt rather than be cognitively experienced. In other words, atmospheres are sensually or sensuously experienced, while characteristics needed to be physically perceived. Wesener writes that atmospheres take the role “as active emotional entities which interlope from the outside and take possession of the individual who experiences them sensuously” (p. 136). He goes further by classifying atmospheres as “pre-dimensional” (p. 136); as entities that are devoid of “visual or tactile form occupying a space” and which “cannot be measured or described in terms of three-dimensional geometry” (p. 136). This, however, makes atmospheres more powerful than three-dimensional objects, argues Wesener, as they have the capability to bring about subjective feelings, thus changing moods. Relating this back to the focus of this research, such subjective emotions are ones that could act as platforms for the “leaping” of the mind beyond the physical.

Liminality therefore refers to a person’s journey of experiencing a transition, being neither this nor that, neither here nor there, and while at the same time being both, or being in both. Liminality is rich with juxtapositions. This very ‘journey’ or straddling of ambiguous thresholds during such transitional phases, and what affordances landscapes might play, is the essence of my research.

For landscape architecture this concept of being neither here nor there, of being neither enclosed nor exposed, might also refer to the sense of being neither totally absorbed in the landscape nor of being within an artefact’s spatial forms. Rather, it is about straddling both entities. It involves the experiencing of the artefact with the environment, as one entity that emerges from the fraying of the boundaries of the two. Landscape theorist Elizabeth Meyer notes how limited sets of binary terms might be in describing landscape’s relationship to people and their created artefacts. Introduced earlier on page 25 and illustrated in Figure 7, Meyer adapted Rosalind Krauss’s diagram from ‘Sculpture in the Expanded Field’ to develop a version
relevant to landscape architecture. Meyer (1997) goes on to suggest alternatives in the formulation of “site description and interpretation” (p. 167) of spaces that occupy the in-between. My research finds that Meyer’s siting of ‘Figure Ground’ in the expanded field, and the deliberations made on it, appears relevant to the examination of liminal landscapes.

It is in the melding of entities within landscapes, whether in the form of landscape’s zonal collapse, or the fusing of designed artefacts with the land that liminal landscapes might be discovered. Such amalgamations might then be utilised in the designing of interventions to further intensify such experiences? This sense of becoming a single entity through the blurring of boundaries is considered important to my research, and has therefore been included as one of the dimensions consolidated in the section on key concepts in Section 2.5.

2.2.2 Liminal Spaces in Landscape

The concept of liminal spaces in landscapes, as introduced in Section 1.2, has been established to comprise two broad categories. Though the differences between the categories might at a glance appear subtle, each nonetheless has the potential to shape effects that are divergently varied. One is the utilising of liminal spaces in landscapes as the setting. The other is the insertion of liminal elements to act as metaphorical reminders. Collectively, however, both categories offer possibilities to enrich encounters within landscapes, tacitly capable of achieving parallel goals of evoking ‘contemplative departures’. This sense of capability raises another question: how would landscape be made to create the state of mind crucial for such crossings of ‘thresholds’? One way to approach this might be in the layering in of the sense of the past, present and future into the inception of design strategies.

Such layerings resonate with the philosopher Martin Heidegger’s concept of present and presencing or presence. In distinguishing between space and place, Heidegger states that “the boundary is that from which something begins its presencing” (Sharr, 2007, p. 51), instead of one at which something stops. Heidegger, according to the architect Adam Sharr (2007), suggests
further that the concept of presencing is the interpenetration or unity of the
three times, in which “each of them is presencing and revealing the others”
(p. 51). To Heidegger, the three times, refer to the past, present and future,
where all three are connected to the present. Heidegger (Heidegger, 1989)
writes,

If the attempt is made to derive from the time of nature what time is,
then the now is the (measure) of past and future. Then time is already
interpreted as present, past is interpreted as no-longer-present, future
as indeterminate not-yet-present... (p. 17E)

Such referring, of the present being a consequent of the past, and of
affecting the future, clearly explains the liminal nature of time, and how the
lingering of ‘happenings’ within one timescale to the other affects and
influences one and the other. This sense of presencing is considered an
important idea in developing the key concepts of my research, and is
therefore included as one of the key dimensions in the formulation of the
concepts. It is gathered and correlated in Section 2.5.

Leading to the discussion of the dimension or dimensionality of time,
Heidegger’s concept extends thoughts into the fourth dimension (Yao,
2007). Yao, in discussing the interrelation between the past, present and
future, draws upon Heidegger’s concept of time and temporality that
consists in the mutual reaching out and opening up of future, past, and
present. Yao, echoing Norberg-Schulz’s writing on Heidegger, explains,

Using the metaphor of the playful mirror...object, image and mirror are
three dimensions, then the light that makes seeing a mirror image is the
fourth dimension. It is the light that lights up the process of seeing and
brings object, image and mirror into play. In the interplay of the four,
they reflect and reveal one another; thus one sees an image in the
mirror. In this metaphor, the light is not something beyond; rather it is
the revealing or presencing of the thing itself. Thus, Heidegger thinks
that what we called the fourth dimension of time should actually be
the first, for it is the most original and determines the rest. (2007, p. 520)

An example of this sense of temporality is in the works of architect Steven
Holl, whose key design philosophy focuses on capturing the essence of
phenomenological experiences. Meant to evoke more sensorial
encounters, Holl uses elements of the environment to act as “phenomenal lenses” (Holl, 1994, p. 80). He demonstrates this concept in one of his designs with the use of ‘captured’ water in a depression. Acting as a liminal element, the water becomes an ephemeral mirror. It ‘brings in’ other elements beyond the physicality of the site, juxtaposing and imposing their presence onto the immediate physical landscape. These ‘other elements’ become ‘present’ in the form of fleeting movements onto a static ground, creating a sense of the fourth dimension. This deliberate yet carefully calculated touch ‘bends’ time, and expands space.

A further potential where more interest might be created is the ephemeral nature of the element itself. For instance, using water as an example still, encounters with it might become more dynamic as its form changes. Water’s varying form, from still to rippling, full-bodied to thinning due to evaporation, having a less dark base to one that is darker (thus intensifying the reflective quality), affords encounters that are ever-evolving. These continuous variations create a sense of the unpredictable. Applying such strategies in the open landscape might create a more intense experience of the fourth dimension; of ‘bended time’, where elements used are themselves ephemeral. Though this might be possible, such thought-provoking temporal elements within the landscape needed to first be identified.

2.2.3 Liminality and Temporality in Landscape

This sense of temporality might also be examined in situations where changes in one space cause an effect on the other. For example, seasonal changes might affect the extent of advancement or recession of these spaces, correspondingly altering the characteristics of the in-between spaces, and the myriad of elements that each contains. The penetration of the elements from one space into the other might be used as hints of the impact that movement has on landscapes. Elements related to time and speed could first be identified and then highlighted – this would allow for the accentuation of time and speed or its lack. The designs of Swiss architect Georges Descombes, whose works are halfway between landscape and contemporary art, are examples of such an approach. Extending the
spatial realm of the immediate physical nature of the landscape, Descombes emphasises memory in his designs through associations with materials. Preferring to work with elements that are already present at each site, Descombes chooses to intensify them, making their presence (and the realisation of the journey these elements have taken to reach their present state and location) felt far beyond. Descombes calls it the “[W]ashing [of] uncovered memory” (Descombes, 2009, p. 129).

Such revealing raises a few questions. Might the significance of such sense of perceptual expansion and extension be the blurring of spatial transitions, and the transcending of spatial constraints? To do so, might it not be necessary to first identify elements that display potentials to evoke memories? In identifying such elements, it might be crucial to also include the finding out of other hidden meanings. Such meanings might be used as a way of layer ‘narratives’ into such understandings of these elements, and the liminal landscapes they are in. These positions might lead the way to strategies that also include the overlaying of the past onto the present, and on which, conjectures about the future might be evoked. This is where, from the standpoint of my research, multiple negotiations might be engaged, making the opening up of, and the jumping across to, different ‘conversations’ possible.

Though discussions on hidden meanings might draw out the desire to take an either essentialist viewpoint or one that considers meanings as social constructions, this research has instead taken the position that both are inevitably entangled to one another. This would ensure that any extracted concepts from the myriad of literature, which could eventually be used to shape key concepts of this research, would be as all encompassing as possible. A key reason for this is, in creating experiences, boundaries are getting increasingly blurred. Spaces are no longer mere physical separations that define zonal interpretations. To designers, spaces project, elements extend and confines explode, thus widening experiences. The experiencing of the land could be one that transcends physical demarcations. Perceptions of a particular landscape, for example, extend beyond its physical adjacency, to say, a working landscape, or to ones that are culturally or historically protected, or even to it being straddled between
zones that are considered ‘too harsh’ due to geological or climatic impositions. The landscape would, instead, be perceived, and appreciated as a totality; its environs included. In short, the experience should be all encompassing, if it strives towards being one that is authentically honest. This reiterates Wesener’s (2014) argument that the concept of ‘experiential authenticity’ should be one that “emphasises the conscious and unconscious experience of place related to inherent or constructed qualities, and influenced by individual, social, and cultural values and meanings” (p. 21).

Such acknowledgements of the various ways of how landscapes bring meanings to different stakeholders echoes the arguments of the architectural academic, Marc Treib. In his essay “Must Landscapes Mean?” (Treib, 2002), Treib cites how Laurie Olin, a landscape architect, classifies meanings in landscapes into two broad categories. For Olin, the first is where landscape as a setting, could evoke “natural meanings”, while the second, termed “evolutionary meanings”, are concerned with “synthetic or invented meanings” (p. 89). These categorisation, according to Treib, is a result of how landscapes are given meanings by the multitude of ‘translators’ like landscape architects, cultural geographers, historians and so forth. Treib believes that with meanings, and how they affect experiences, there will not be a need to ‘blindly’ follow historical references, like the producing of ‘replicas’ of the site to serve as ‘reminders’. Rather, through correct understandings, the key purpose of interventions could be focused towards the solving of problems or issues of “open space and form” (p. 90).

In referring to the genius loci, for example, following Treib’s arguments about knowing, understanding and respecting what were present in the landscapes as a means of responding to them, might be useful. This can be in the form of remediation strategies or the changing of usage to adapt to prevailing soil conditions. This tangential approach, as compared to mere ‘re-creating’ of the past, might be more meaningful.

However, Treib acknowledges that to understand landscape fully would require “multiple semantic dimensions” (Treib, 2002, p. 97). Referring to landscapes as also having the potential to act as intimations of
“interpretations and meanings outside the immediate landscape” (p. 98), Treib suggests that “meaning is indeed dynamic and ever-changing” (p. 98). Taking Treib’s other position also into account, this research considers that in the search for meanings in landscapes, things are not so clear cut. In fact, this wealth of approaches seems to reiterate the liminal nature of interpretations. This strengthens the argument that inventorying should indeed be all encompassing, or as summed up by Treib, that “it is not one or the other, but a merging of approaches” (Treib, 2002, p. 96). This might include the crossing of temporal boundaries.

The sense of something fleeting, of leaping back and forth across timescales, seems to reiterate the need for engaging designs that stem from a detailed and clear understanding of the dynamic forces acting on landscapes. This shuttling through time is akin to the way environmental artists embark on their creative pursuits. Careful observations, a way of ‘re-looking’ at elements in the landscape, lead to the selecting and eventual stage of ‘re-defining’ these very elements. As they become adopted into fresh interpretations, the existing form of these elements becomes altered, a marked difference from their previous existence. Artists like Martin Hill and Andy Goldsworthy are concerned with the concept of ephemerality and utilise such ideas of temporality as a means of raising awareness of the cyclical nature of time. Using their own bodies as the liminal element between landscape and the natural elements, the works of Hill and Goldsworthy converge on the idea of engaging the past, present and future (Goldsworthy, Time, 2008, p. 7). Stating that his works anticipate, but do not predict or control, the future, Goldsworthy writes,

In order to understand time, I must work with the past, present and future. I work in a landscape made rich by the people who have worked and farmed it. I can feel the presence of those who have gone before me….my touch is the most recent layer of many layers that are embedded in the landscape which in turn will be covered by future layers – hidden but always present (2008, p. 7)

Forces of nature react on these sculptures, and as intended by the artists, indirectly participate in the ‘re-enactment’ of these artworks, re-shaping them. The ‘picked’ elements, ones that are used to achieve the
choreographed purpose as metaphorical reminders, are then allowed to get silently re-absorbed into the environment, just as the many other ‘un-picked’ ones. Hill’s work is shown in Figure 9 (page 39) as an example of such an approach. These artists argue that artworks that use elements within and around the landscape to create contrasts are, when depicted metaphorically, encourage contemplative departures (Jones, 2007, p. 177).

Jones writes,

Martin Hill’s sculptures, utilising materials sourced from landscapes, and eventual works dictated by the location and conditions – the ideas are expressed by learning from and working with the relationships between these ingredients – ‘Climbing Sculpture’ (sand collected from lakeshore and carried up rock pinnacle to create sculpture on summit) just for the sand to be blown away in time...showing us the beauty of nature, visually and metaphorically, because the cyclical way in which nature’s works is a guide to our own destiny, should we choose to see it. (2007, p. 177)

Figure 9 Metaphorical depiction acts as a means to evoke the sense of temporality (Image from Hill, 2007, p. 51)
Strategies that employ the sense of metaphorical depiction pull one into a contemplative frame of mind, instilling awareness of the cyclical realm of presence, of which humans are a part. The use of such liminal elements might create designs that highlight cyclical transformations through absorbing engagements with landscapes, ones that evolve with the seasons. Such engagements, in turn, might instil awareness for the hidden, akin to suggestions of art’s affordance to make “the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’” (Dee, 2004, p. 50) – see Figure 9. Such affordances might be another important and relevant dimension on which the key concepts of this research (correlated in Section 2.5) might be framed.

The concept of transience has been discussed and embodied in designs across other design disciplines. The focus revolves around the desire to extract the essence of elements as a means of engaging materials that allow certain effects to be achieved. The Japanese architect Hitoshi Abe for example, exploits the presence of light as a liminal element, creating three and four dimensional spaces. For Abe, the tactility of such “visual vibrations” (Abe, 2011, p. 163) embodies the Japanese concept of using light as a means to perceive the gradual passage of time (Brownell, 2011). Using a series of other liminal elements, like layers of screens, to create a kaleidoscopic effect, Abe simultaneously addresses the utilitarian need to separate public and private realms (Abe, 2011). To the Japanese, such positive responses to the environment, and ones that engage and exploit natural phenomena through the insertion of interventions, are considered as the marrying of concepts to reality. This sense of amalgamation occurs when the “unmeasurable” abstractions are juxtaposed onto the “measurable” (Brownell, 2011, p. 11) realm of corporeality.

Design, to the Japanese, is regarded as a means of channelling contemplations of the sublime towards materiality or physicality. Architectural scholar Blaine Brownell writes that such acceptances, where consciousness is translated into substance, lead to the holistic approach to designing, where “craft, procedure, and technique are tools to bridge mind and matter, projecting ideas onto material” (Brownell, 2011, p. 13). What this means is how the Japanese decodes thoughts into practical crafts, even to the point of inventing new tools to physically realise what has been
conceptualised in the mind. As an example, the understanding of how complex an effect needed to be, say, the illusion of ‘floating eaves’, would have demanded the careful understanding of the practicalities, from knowing existing strengths and limitations of materials, to the eventual configuring out of specific detailing.

The works of architect Tadao Ando exemplify this approach. Ando sees the connection between people and the environment as opportunities for expressing encounters of the in-between, and believes that abstraction is key. In allowing nature to participate in such designs, and “as it is activated by human life, its abstract existences achieve vibrancy in its meeting with concreteness”, where the spatial encounter created during such moments will be one that “provokes and inspires” (Ando, 1996, p. 458). Ando further elaborates that such sensibility “de-emphasizes the physical boundary” between built form and its surrounding nature, resulting in the establishing instead of a “spiritual threshold” (Ando, 1996, p. 460). This sense of utilising design’s capacity as a means of connecting realms can be associated with the potential role that landscape’s liminal elements might play.

As noted by anthropologist Edward Hall, such roles are meant to give meaning in the Japanese concept of space. Rather than perceiving space as an entity that is empty, or of ‘nothingness’, it is instead bestowed as a means of anticipation. The idea is to understand, and to perceive the shape and arrangement of spaces (Hall, 1966), where spaces are considered as pauses instead. Here, spaces are not considered as vessels that needed to be filled in with objects. Rather, they are entities that could foster relationships between objects. Actings as pauses, spaces are therefore regarded as the ‘non-object’, which together with the objects, form an interactive composition.

Designs are therefore meant to allow objects to enter a dialogue with space, contrary to Western thinking, where space is rendered a negative connotation, considered merely as the distance between objects.
Such approaches, where designs are deliberately conceptualised within ‘spaces’ might find parallels to the positive appreciation accorded by the Japanese. This, in turn, could provide clues for designers who intend to insert interventions within liminal space. This is where a kind of design lexicon might need to first be established, one that is in tune with the way these liminal spaces are analysed. Such an analysis and design strategy might highlight the mutual permeation that liminal elements can offer in order to stimulate such engaging elicitations.

Such immersive encounters with the environment are echoed by Seamon, who posits a range of engagements that gradually makes the ‘experiencer’ come closer to, or move further away from the environment. He grounds his approach on observations and analyses, which determine where one sits on the scale is dependent on the kinds of activities that are inserted into the environment (Seamon, 1979, p. 100). Seamon puts forward his concepts of the interrelationship between people and the environment, where the kinds of encounter affect the level of engagement, or separation between them.

Seamon identifies such encounters as belonging to five main types – obliviousness, noticing, watching, heightened contact and basic contact. These, according to Seamon, are very much determined by the level of interaction, afforded by the landscape, and at different moments. Of interest to my research is the aspect of being intensely aware of the environment. This sense of awareness, according to Seamon (1979), occurs when the person might “even feel that he is in perpetual union with it” (p. 100). Identifying that such experiences are ones where the person ‘merges with his environment’, Seamon reiterates that such states of mind might only be possible when “there is a break in the boundary between person (self) and the world (non-self)” (Seamon, 1979, p. 100).

Several questions arise from this understanding. Will it be possible then for landscapes to act as a setting that performs the role of a liminal platform between the ‘experiencer’ and the inserted activity, where such ‘merging’ might be induced? Might the possibility of this ‘merging’ be accelerated through interventions that focus more on ‘re-engaging’ the landscape, through the heightening of awareness for the environment, and using the
environment itself as a tool? Might this, in turn, be a way where liminal spaces are engaged, and from which, reminders, of one's embodiment with the world, or of the presence of Being, are revealed?

Bowring believes that this is possible. For instance, in her discussion on the role water plays in evoking the temporal, Bowring highlights the capacity water holds as a means to make spiritual connections, on top of its acceptance in a more “universal contemplative aspect” (Bowring, 2004, p. 50). In acknowledging the physical presence of water in the landscape, followed by the deliberate ‘bringing in’ of it as part of engaging inside to outside, and of built form to the land, design foregrounds the role water plays as a connector, both in the physical and metaphysical worlds. Water is a landscape element that shows characteristics of being liminal, and as illustrated in Bowring’s examples, highlights varying levels of ephemeral quality.

Such intertwining gestures towards how cultural geographer John Wylie explains the interconnectivity between landscape, vision and embodiment. For Wylie, who maintains that vision remains key in “viewing the world from within”, contrary to what he terms “a gaze from without” (Wylie, 2007, p. 150), interrelationships such as this open up reflections into the sense of embodiment. Wylie runs his concept alongside Merleau-Ponty, who interlaces self to landscape. This might be read as a resonance to Wylie’s own ‘perspective’, where just like one’s other senses, appreciation of the world through vision is considered a way of embodying one’s self to it.

From the context of my research, the above discussion would seem to imply that landscapes do exhibit potentials to unfold experiences both physically and metaphysically. Landscapes do so through the deployment of spaces and elements that possess the characteristics of being liminal. The next section will examine how such understandings might be translated into the experiencing of landscapes.
2.3 METAPHYSICAL LANDSCAPES

The understandings outlined in the previous section of landscape’s physicality have now set the pace for the next standpoint adopted in my research: the examination of the metaphysical. Three angles are considered to be of relevance in terms of defining the word metaphysical. This section explores these three dimensions: transcending physical matter, the immediacy of experience, and projection.

2.3.1 Of Transcending Physical Matter

The capacity of landscapes as settings has been discussed at length in earlier sections of my research, leading to the inquiry as to whether or not physical landscapes could be better understood beyond the dimension of their physical space. It has also been established that designs might play a major role in facilitating the leap beyond landscape’s physicality. One such strategy is the designing of interventions that are perceived as an entirety with the environment, creating a state of mind that is conducive for an immersive experience. When one is in such an absorbed frame of mind, the awareness of the presence of the physical intervention, and of the environment becomes non-existent, as the person departs into the realm of the subliminal.

This venturing of the mind is what Tuan considers to be the dictating elements or outcomes of a successful design, where the ‘engagers’ are “conscious only of their own kinaesthetic joy and of the potential field for action. In such a setting, they are barely aware of the environmental design and equipment that make their activities possible” (Tuan, 1979, p. 99). Tuan’s example, brings forth the sense that the two highlighted discussions, outlined in the previous paragraph, are indeed possible. This runs parallel to Seamon’s thinking that the affordances of the landscape and its elements, in particular experiences of the metaphysical, could only be encountered when one is fully engaged with, and absorbed within it. Seamon terms this as being in a state of heightened contact, as compared to that of obliviousness (Seamon, 1979).
As shown in Figure 10, Seamon (1979) places the former position towards what he coins as the “tendency towards person-environment mergence” (p. 99), one that is a crucial ingredient to achieving the desired experiential outcome. Seamon explains further that by considering the environment as a source of information, and as that source fluctuates, the nature of behaviour in space responds correspondingly.

Figure 10 Modes of Encounter – An Awareness Continuum (Seamon, 1979)

Figure 11, the equally adapting level of immersion with, or into the environment creates a direct impact as to how the person reacts to the environment.

From these understandings, further questions arise: how might designs change the way particular landscapes are perceived, and in so-doing, how do liminal experiences contribute to such perceptions?

One tentative answer is that through designs, in particular those injected into liminal landscapes, spaces within existing landscapes might be perceived anew. Such interventions can be utilised as a means of not only highlighting the presence of these liminal landscapes, but to also alter the way as to how physical elements within adjacent zones might be perceived.
In short, through the insertion of interventions, these in-between spaces, might be read anew as ‘places’, ones that neither replicate the experiences encountered in their adjacent spaces, nor ones that feel totally alien. Rather, these spaces might contain elements from their adjacencies, yet inject a sense of ‘freshness’ as to how they could be engaged and experienced. As an example, a crumbling cliff face of an adjacent space could have its rocks chipped down and used as a groundcover that when stepped on, would create a dynamic and textural effect on a person.

In the architectural critic Kenneth Frampton’s discussion of Heidegger, such conscious effort in placing an object in nature, or the re-arrangement of nature itself, constitutes what he considers as the “minimum physical pre-condition” (Frampton, 1996, p. 444) for defining a place. For instance, the insertion of a viewing platform that runs beyond a physical edge of a cliff, projecting outwards into the ravine, might also evoke an overwhelming sense of fear, or of exhilaration. These mixed emotions in turn, which would...
have otherwise not be felt should there be no crossing of the visual and
telluric thresholds, can be used to draw out an acute sense of respect for
landscape’s many and abrupt impositions. The platform, acting as a space
where liminal experiences can be encountered, transforms the way the
ravine is perceived: one that shifts from a view that provokes awe, to one
that calls for extreme caution. It becomes a ‘place’ that induces certain
‘other’ sensations.

This is in line with the way Heidegger explores the concept of how ‘place’
happens (Sharr, 2007). For Heidegger, according to Sharr, a place that has
already been recognised in one way might be re-perceived as a ‘new’
place, upon which ‘new’ functions await to be discovered. Taking this train
of thought further, the landscape designer might ride on the opportunity to
design encounters, which ‘re-engage’ landscape at levels that are beyond
what were not previously conceivable due to the ‘non-presence’ of the
intervention. This is akin to how Heidegger describes the functions that a
bridge might perform beyond that of a connector. It engages the
landscape in more ways than one. The bridge defines the spaces that
separately come into an interface with it. In short, such ‘re-engagements’
might be adopted as a device to transform a site or a space in the
landscape into one that is a defined place, one that Heidegger describes as
making a place to “come into presence” (Norberg-Schulz, Heidegger’s

This sense of re-engagement is considered as another key dimension on
which the key concepts for my research might be based on. This dimension
is included in the compilation tabled in Section 2.5.

Such ‘re-definitions’ of what a place is, and what it stands anew for, might
be a means of perceiving landscapes that transcend physical matter. For
instance, one possible approach might be to relate the sense of
“immanence” to that of “transcendence” (Bowring, 2004, p. 50), where the
manifestation of ‘Being’ into physical landscapes could evoke thoughts into
the realm of the latter. In one of Bowring’s example, such thoughts are
brought about through the intentional placement of transparent windows in
churches as a means of bringing about contemplative thoughts of transcendence; of ‘going beyond’.

In attempting to respond to such lines of inquiry, the designer might need to inquire deeper into what could ‘effect’ this sense of transcendence. One possible angle is to delve into how physical matters might be perceived beyond the ‘first glance’. Through focusing on the details of the physical matter, such as its make-up, an abstract connection might be revealed, one that captures the essence of its presence, and upon which, an intervention might be conceptualised.

For example, the ‘re-using’ of a tall, fallen tree as a horizontal bridge can be for the obvious purpose as an element that joins. But more than that, its affordance as a versatile building material can be revealed, one that is ‘alive’ with textures, warmth and sense of age and of grounding back to the land. These qualities can be emphasised through the designer’s act of detailing. It assumes the form an artefact. This is parallel to how the Japanese contemplate ‘vast-ness’ within the ‘focused realm of detailing’. As noted by the architectural scholar Blaine Brownell, “… weighty, monumental buildings... articulated with nimble bracketing and graceful eaves, convey(s) an otherworldly presence” (Brownell, 2011, p. 19). Such strategies, according to Brownell, where massiveness is broken down, dissolves the boundary between inside and outside, which result in the evoking of “a sense of unreality”. Should specific methods of inventorying not be devised, the unravelling of such possibilities might remain silently hidden.

Taken even a step further, such in-depth inventoring might extend the possibility of having design trigger contemplations from the opposite standpoint. Noting that such approaches can be equally enriching, Bowring draws attention to this angle by explaining how ‘focusing-in’ might actually open up deliberations into phenomena in the larger context. Citing the example of a framed view out into the landscape, Bowring stresses that such convergence might have a “paradoxical effect of achieving a more intense connection to landscape”, where the unearthing of the large within the small might evoke a “phenomenological intensity” (Bowring, 2004, p. 50).
Such a tension, one that opens insights of one realm within the experiential realm of another, and vice versa, is where understanding of landscape’s constant state of flux might be capitalised to augment the effects desired in interventions.

This sense of ‘focusing in’ in order to ‘open up’ might be considered as another key dimension that my research could use in the formulation of the key concepts, and is included as part of the consolidation in Section 2.5.

Strikingly, however, such fluidity is not restricted to the existing condition of the environment. It is crucial for the designer to understand that any attempt to alter the current state of the landscape might mutate it further. This reiterates the architect Tadao Ando’s position, where in referring to the introduction of architecture into an environment, a “new landscape” gets created. This leads to Ando calling for a dialogue, instead of an imposition of the former into the latter. Ando argues that such dialogues would make it necessary to discover a built form “which the site itself is seeking” (Ando, 1996, p. 460). Applied into landscape architecture, the designer therefore needs to be aware, prior to the inception of any ideas for the insertion of artefacts, that such introduction would inevitably alter the environment. Such modifications might offer possibilities to the informed designer, who might have them used to the advantage of the proposal. Would one strategy then be the insertion of another liminal ‘element’ in the form of a pause?

The Japanese concept of ma, or as the architect Kengo Kuma calls it “strategic pause” (Kuma, 2011, p. 36), could act as a counterbalance to the sense of ‘intrusion’ that interventions are perceived. Designed as intervals, these ‘pauses’ could instead be perceived as a means to dematerialise matters to ‘silently’ integrate design into the landscape. Metaphysicists term these pauses as “intervals” (Taylor, 1992, p. 70), on which the basis of a relationship between things with a temporal frame is derived. Architectural design strategies like the play of the interstice, darkness, aperture, transience, and projection of the body are examples of the plethora of possibilities that the landscape architect might be equipped with as ways to effectuate pauses (Brownell, 2011).
This concept of pausing runs parallel to how Pallasmaa, in citing studies by the architectural professor Fred Thompson, refers to the ‘seeing anew’ of space as “spacing”, and pauses as “pausing” (Pallasmaa, 1996, p. 68). Such relational understanding of space readies the landscape architect to engage in dynamic interactions and interrelationships that frees current conception that reinterprets objects from mere static entities into ones that allow for the act of experiencing.

This is akin to Pallasmaa’s concept of silence as a means for connecting to the realm of the unconscious through the participation into cycles of time (Pallasmaa, 1996). Such ‘strategic pauses’ are relevant and important to my research. It is considered another important dimension on which the key concepts of my research would be based and is included to the compilation in Section 2.5.

Its importance could be illustrated in Figure 12, where, in The Arizona 9/11 Memorial by CoLab Studio, the sense of ‘spacing’ is achieved from the juxtaposition of a simple structure, with nature. The design uses steel panels with laser cut inscriptions, to cast shadows. The legibility of the ‘cast inscriptions’ changes gradually from blur to one that is focused, then back to being blur, as the angle of the sun shifts throughout the day. The shadow, or rather, the absence of it, fills the space below with the ‘projected’ inscriptions, creating a sense of dialogue between artefact and ‘spacing’.

My research reiterates the need for a design lexicon that specifically caters to the inventoring, and eventual designing of liminal spaces in landscapes. Such interpretive possibilities, or hermeneutical perceptions of landscapes will be examined further in the section pertaining to landscape experiences.
2.3.2 Of Immediacy of Experience

Another aspect from which landscape’s capacity to allow for the meandering of the mind might be examined is from the ontological concepts of how things come about, and their relations to each other (Taylor, 1992). Of particular relevance is the concept of phenomenology as espoused by Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger, where the immediacy of experience is emphasised. Isolating experience from all assumptions concerning existence, such philosophical movements describe the formal structure of the objects of awareness and of awareness itself. In other words, it lays bare its essential structure.
Seamon and Mugerauer, citing the geographer Edward Relph, explains phenomenology as an aim to understand the nature of immersion through the sense of “wonder” (Seamon & Mugerauer, 1985, p. 3) that is evoked as we experience the world anew. For Relph, whose interests run along the lines of the phenomenological approach to environmental and landscape issues, such immersions are derived from the fundamental pursuit of the sense of the ‘original’. Borrowing from Heidegger, Relph grounds his approach in a ‘return’ to the concept of “wonder” (Relph, 1985, p. 16), described as a compassionate intelligence that seeks to see things in themselves. One such example that might be applied in landscape design is where the distinct boundary, perceived between an object, such as a ‘sculptural tree’, and its constituents, like the shape of its branches and the colour of its leaves, becomes softened. In the hands of a ‘well-informed’ designer, backed with a deep knowledge and understanding of such trees through careful inventorying, the ‘sculptural tree’ might be perceived at a distance as one that pulls the space together. In the same breath, with sensitive articulation that brings one’s senses close, that same tree might be ‘re-read’ as a design gesture that acknowledges its textural rarity. Might applying such manoeuvres into landscape designs therefore ‘speed up’ such leaps beyond the physicality of matter? This sense of ‘wonder’ is another important dimension that could frame the key concepts of my research and is gathered with other relevant ones in Section 2.5.

Can such going back-and-forth, to landscape’s capacity in continually engaging the mind, be used as a means to design interventions that are perceivable from different angles, one that engages the concept of multi-perspectivism as an experiential journey? Though the concept of multi-perspective experiencing will be examined further in the section on landscape experience, what is of relevance here is where the use of such strategies might deliberately slow down the process of discovery. This might be employed to counter the desire of the merely hastened ‘seeing’ of one view to the next. The unstitching of landscape’s intricately-seamed physical juxtapositions might lead to the eventual unravelling of the make-up of its whole. For example, using specific inventorying strategies, teased out liminal elements within the landscape might give clues as to how the overall space has gelled through time. It is during such disentanglement that a reflection towards the sublime might be evoked. Tuan refers to such complicity in
describing the landscape as “a composite feature in which elements of function and of use combine with values that transcend them”. Concluding that landscapes should therefore not be defined by having its parts itemised, Tuan reiterates that these parts should instead act as “subsidiary clues to an integrated image” (Tuan, 1979, p. 89).

Landscape, to Tuan, is such an image, one that dwells within the “construct of the mind and of feeling” (Tuan, 1979, p. 100). Such thinking brings this discussion into the realm of understanding the whole from landscape’s parts, of which liminal spaces are part. This concept is considered another key dimension to which my research could refer in the framing of the key concepts, and is added to the compilation in Section 2.5.

From a more panoptic standpoint, theoretical positions, like the physics and philosophy academic Henri Bortoft’s, where the whole could be encountered through the parts, might become applicable. Again, this may serve as a point of argument to the belief in ‘selecting’ only the ‘aesthetically-pleasing’ parts of the landscape as being worth showcasing. Instead, what is delved into here is the manner in which Bortoft considers the ‘seeing’ of the part in light of the whole as an integral way of experiencing, and appreciating landscape (Bortoft, 1985). This is contrary to the linearity of an understanding of ‘seeing’ the whole only after ‘seeing’ the parts. Though there is a subtle difference, the effect of each is one that moves tangentially away from the other.

Extrapolated into landscape thinking, and linking back to the Japanese sense of ‘emptiness’, Bortoft’s argument that the ‘whole’ is primary poses a challenge for the designer to find the “right parts” (Bortoft, 1985, p. 287). This is where the concept of phenomenology comes into direct play. Might the laying bare of landscape elements then be a strategy to find this ‘hidden’ part? For instance, in designing a bridge within the landscape, the designer might consider the use of elements within the immediate vicinity of the site. Other than the more obvious leverage into the technical and ecological deliberations, what is more importantly achieved is the reminder of the landscape-at-large. The deliberate act of converting a fallen tree as the building block of the bridge, for example, re-focuses the attention from one
that perceives it as an object into one that might lead to the appreciation that it was part of a larger whole. An example, in the form of a bicycle rack, could be used to illustrate this point. Figure 13 below shows a series of images of two different designs within the same park: one using a material that is foreign to the site, the other, using what could probably be made from a fallen tree within the locale.

![Figure 13](Top) Steel bicycle rack, showing a lack of reference to its context. (Bottom left) Timber bicycle rack, probably made from a fallen tree within the site, like the one shown (Bottom right), acting as a reminder of the landscape-at-large (Images by author, taken at Victoria Park, Christchurch)

Such morphing, through the ‘re-positioning’ of a ‘landscape part’ creates a sense of ‘active absence’, a deliberate move in the intuitive mode of consciousness. This act of focusing is referred to by Bortoft as “primal phenomenon”, on which his concept of “authentic wholeness” (Bortoft, 1985, p. 297) takes root. Metaphorically linking the former to creative writing, where the task is to find the right expression in letting the meaning come forth, Bortoft’s position might be considered comparable to the concept of abstraction, which will be examined in the next section. Consequently, Bortoft’s sense of “authentic wholeness” might then be described as the unravelling of the part that contains the whole, as in the example of the bridge. Using the fallen tree might run contrary to current beliefs that ‘new’ interventions needed to be ‘new’ and pleasantly presented, as would be ‘visible’ using aesthetically-pleasing, chemically-treated, mass-produced timber. Instead, this deliberate acceptance of re-adaptive use might present the designer with an opportunity to embrace the idea of transience and imperfection, which lies in abundance in nature, and around which landscape revolves. This concept of ‘authentic wholeness’ is considered relevant to form part of the framework in the key concepts of this research. It is referred to in Section 2.5.
Resonating with the Japanese concept of wabi-sabi, this creates a sense of appreciation for the ephemeral, one which Pallasmaa refers to as the existence of all matters in the continuum of time. As shown in Figure 14, this concept is meant to evoke a state of mind that bridges the physical to the metaphysical, and the present to what is beyond. One example, according to Pallasmaa, is the patina of wear, which enriches the experience of time (Pallasmaa, 1996). Taking the form of an ‘additive’ layering, like the chemical reaction to copper, or of a ‘subtractive’ nature, like the shine from caressing touches, such enrichments might be considered as liminal, ones that the designer might choose to adopt.

Figure 14 The understandings in the Japanese concept of wabi-sabi (Image from Koren, 1994, pp. 40-41)
Might such approaches to the designing of liminal landscapes, where the imperfection of elements is expressed, serve as a reminder of the possibility of such irregularity and impermanence to bring out the ingenuous integrity of natural objects and processes? As Bortoft writes, “[P]henomenology brings to light what is there, but at first may be hidden” (Bortoft, 1985, p. 299).

2.3.3 Of Projection (Past, Present and Future Correlation)

The third consideration of metaphysics is the sense of projection, or thoughts into the future, that landscape is able to conjure. Selective and deliberate insertions of interventions that might evoke such perceptions could be applied as a way of connecting the past to the future. This tripartite connection is where Hall believes that “memory and imagination should always participate in perceptions” (Hall, 1966, p. 152). It might therefore be explained that the present is a consequence of the past, and the present has an effect on the future.

One such example is where a study of precedents might be used as a means to better inform the designer of certain significances that might have shaped the landscape to its present day existence; ones that needed to be made aware of. Instead of being considered as a way of having the mind contaminated, precedents might serve to inform and “build up an intimate knowledge of historical, cultural significance of the potential of the medium” (Moore, 2010, p. 156). According to the landscape theorist and academic Kathryn Moore, the careful collation and utilisation of precedents should include images and theories. From the standpoint of my research, such collations might evoke ideas, which in turn craft concepts, becoming a form of suggestion for the future.

This can be read as a means of crucially setting the mind within a field from which meanings might be teased out. Citing the philosopher John Dewey, Moore suggests further that such ‘floating’ of meanings, being at the “foreground and background of consciousness” (Moore, 2010, p. 161) might act as cues for designing, acting as a departure from relying solely on “intuition”. Instead of relying on either approach, a mergence, between the long-standing concept of intuition and that of understandings from
precedents, might instead assist the designer to be more equipped in proposing richer interventions.

This might find an echo in the arguments raised by the psychiatrist Carl Jung, who reiterates the importance of cues in jolting memories. As discussed in the earlier section on liminal landscapes, the placement of liminal elements in landscapes which do not exhibit characteristics of being liminal, might trigger thoughts that have remained hovering in the subliminal threshold. Jung would relate to this as an opportunity in which symbols might play a role (Jung, 1964), another potentially important dimension in the shaping of the key concepts of this research (Section 2.5).

Taking Jung’s thinking further, this sense of overlapping thoughts in the unconscious mind with those which are more controlled through conscious efforts, is not new. The arts discipline has long adopted such approaches in its emphasis to create the sense of ‘spirit’ in artworks. This approach might be explained through the concept of “collective unconscious”, advanced by the psychologist and analyst Anelia Jaffe, who worked closely with Jung. For Jaffe, the emphasis on this “spirit” in art might be one indication of the “shifting, indefinable borderline between religion and art” (Jaffe, 1964, p. 260), where at times, one cannot be separated from the other. Jaffe’s example leads to the explanation of how things might become more abstract when the conscious control is overcome by the unconscious. This sense of abstraction, might be a way for the landscape designer to express a more symbolic form of connecting the past and future, through the experiencing of the present. In a way, abstract symbolism becomes a liminal element, as shown, for instance, in Figure 15. In this example, the Stonehenge encapsulates the sense of obscurity referred to here, as the experience of the symbolic spans the religious, folklore and culture, as much as the puzzling physical connection between human ingenuity, the site, and its elements.

Might this be an opportunity to form strategies, akin to those taken by modern artists, where abstraction is used to bestow a visible form to the “life behind things” (Jaffe, 1964, p. 300)? This sense of abstraction might be a
suitable approach to express such connections, indirectly creating a link between the domains of the physical and metaphysical.

Figure 15 A series of photos of the Stonehenge showing the sense of awe not only for the symbolic, but also for the mystery and fascination to human ingenuity in the connecting of life’s understandings to the site (Image from http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/)
The landscape designer, in adopting such strategies, might present possibilities where this sense of correlating the three temporal domains remains grounded to the site. By inserting a symbolic abstraction of landscape elements within the site, the projections into the future would remain situated, maintaining a sense of place. This would tie encounters and thoughts about the future to the specificity of the physical place; of being in the presence of familiar objects of the surroundings. Such tying back maintains the richness of the experience, contrary to those that could occur in any space.

In a similar vein, Seamon and Mugerauer, in citing Relph, reinforce the acknowledgement that places are qualitatively different from space in that they “are constituted in our memories and affections through repeated encounters and complex associations” (Seamon & Mugerauer, 1985, p. 6). However, arriving at the threshold between the outsets of what is considered place from that of space might be not as forthright. It nevertheless presents a point of great promise, and it falls on the designer to capitalise on such potentials. Bachelard interprets the arrival at such junctures as the “primacy of imagination” (Bachelard, 1958, p. 224), and in his discussion on the dialectics of outside and inside, stresses the profound level of possibilities that each side offers, ones that not only carry the ‘positive-ness’ of the future, but also offer the immediacy of reflecting on the past.

An important aspect of phenomenology in landscape architecture is its relevance to “Critical Regionalism” (Frampton, 1996b, p. 468). Though purported more as the re-grounding of ‘fashionable’ architecture or built form, my research finds resonance in two essential aspects.

One is the understanding of ‘place’, the other, of tectonics. Translating these concepts into landscape might prove pivotal in forming the necessary ‘surrounds’ on which the designer’s mind could float in, and extract from. Already mentioned is the liminal status in which the designer is positioned, by being an ‘outsider’. Encompassing the mind with the particularities of the site might assist the designer in finding a bearing towards a more concerted effort to conceptualise interventions. This ‘inside’ information, rich with
specificities, would be rich with not only historical connections and narratives, but also with an on-going temporal fluidity that is ever-present.

For example, a historical site, experienced anew in the form of a change of use, would constantly be subjected to constant ‘re-interpretations’. This could come in the way visitors and users engage the site, or in the way new and fresh perceptions are projected. Merging both the ‘outside’ and ‘inside’ information, focusing not only on the overarching sense of place, the designer might even be able to extract hints on the sense of tectonics that the elements within the place might be capable of. The dedicating of particular attention to the two aspects might become one of the key strategies that the landscape architect might adopt in order to avoid what has been referred to by the architectural theorist Kenneth Frampton as the homogenisation of the environment. These aspects might be necessary in setting a liminal landscape apart from its adjacencies, made even more crucial since it has been established that such a space is rich with possibilities due to its nature of being in between.

These liminal spaces, thus present opportunities for unexpected outcomes by their silent presence. They form contrasts; creating tensions, thus allowing the experience of activities or events that occur within them to be expanded and extended well beyond their physical boundaries. The designer might achieve these through linking the past to the future, by being in the present, or as Pallasmaa interprets it as the connecting of the absent to the present (Pallasmaa, 1996). The activities or events might eventually be as one with the environment. The ‘stage’ is not just an empty, soul-less space. Rather, it contributes to the overall experience of the event. It becomes a place. One thing that the designer needed to keep in mind is that even though the space seems to be just a vacant or leftover lot, it continues to exude its own character. It does not cease displaying its own, unique sense of genius loci, or the spirit of the place (Shields, 1991).

In other words, genius loci is the typical ‘atmosphere’ or ambience of a place. It gives hints to the qualities that are, or used to be inherent in the place. Christian Norberg-Schulz, an architectural theorist, writes that in order to fully grasp the genius loci, the concept of “character” is an important
step in understanding the “structure of places” (Norberg-Schulz, 1996, p. 418). According to him, ‘character’ is defined by how things are. In other words, it is the ‘atmosphere’. This position runs parallel to those of both Bohme and Andreas, as mentioned in Section 2.2.1 earlier.

This sense of genius loci is considered as another key dimension on which the key concepts of my research (Section 2.5) might be based.

Shields also highlights this point in noting that sites are “never simply locations” (Shields, 1991, p. 6). In examining spatial concepts as the alternative geographies of modernity, where elements of imaginary geographies are used interchangeably as metaphors for more abstract distinction, he highlights this through genius loci, or as he calls it the “unique sense of place” (Shields, 1991, p. 6). This uniqueness is equally rich in memories, be it in the form of cultural and social linkages, or geomorphological fluctuations that shaped associations and engagements with these sites.

This is where my research considers that liminal space, being either interstitial, peripheral, leftover, or just as separation bands, each has unique characteristics within them. During the process of inventorying, where such qualities are unravelled layer by layer, liminal spaces could begin to reveal their potentials, ones that are richer than what each of their separate, individual, surrounding entities have amongst them. From the metaphysical standpoint, would such unravelling, when recognised and applied into interventions, then be a means to enrich what Pallasmaa refers to as the interrelationship between perception, memory and imagination (Pallasmaa, 1996)? Such applications might be a way of evoking the feeling of delight in the magical, or the inspiring sense spiritual mystery and awe in the mystical that characterise the metaphysical dimension.

The discussions within this section have painted different scenarios as to how the concept of metaphysics might be adopted into landscape designs. Coupled with discussions in earlier sections, where concepts are rooted in the physical nature of landscapes, the challenge that my research is keen to
address is the merging of such considerations. This stems from the desire to steer space and place inventorying, from which thoughts on design are derived, to ones that could zoom in on liminal characteristics within the landscape. Such guidance has the ability to distinguish and extract the abundance of rich correlations between identified elements. Currently, mergings, or crossings of the realm of the physical, might be ‘seen’ as one ontological ‘contamination’ of the other. However, careful and detailed inventorying might instead cast a more positive outlook, thereby bringing about a ‘fresh’ perception of the landscape. The architect and urban planner Alex Selenitsch has pointed out that such movements occur “over a creative liminal zone where what is firmly established in one discourse is transformed when brought to the other” (Selenitsch, 2004, p. 425). Such approaches might then be employed to craft one viable way of inventorying, as will be explained in the next two sections.

2.4 LANDSCAPE EXPERIENCE

To experience landscape is to relate humans’ responses to it. These responses are, as reinforced throughout my research, very much dependent on humans’ perception of the environment. Humans’ senses might be regarded as liminal entities. They act as the in-between upon which the environment is first perceived, then understood, and thereon, be acted upon. A clear understanding of the nature and the affordance of the senses is therefore crucial for the designer. Doing so might enable the designer to conceptualise interventions that are rich and engaging. Therefore, to understand one’s embodiment into the landscape is as crucial.

Instead, the concept is rooted in the acknowledgement that people and landscape are extensions of one to the other. This sets the framework for the designer that interventions, being liminal, should be ones that address both entities, instead of placing an importance of one over the other. Another aspect that needs to be emphasised is the hermeneutical power that language affords in describing and interpreting the environment. The discussion on this liminal capacity places language in a position that demands attention from the designer, who might consider its inclusion as a key means of inventorying.
2.4.1 Perception of Landscape

Much study has been devoted to the concept of perception. The way in which landscape is regarded, understood, or interpreted has, in turn, been the basis of how human behaviour is shaped, and to which the landscape is shaped in return (Ittelson, 1973; Tuan, 1974). Much has also been analysed with regard to human senses, on which the distinctive perceptual systems have been derived. These, in turn, have provided for better understanding of the levels of contact with, and the sense of orientation within the environment (Gibson, 1966), (Malnar & Vodvarka, 2004), (Roy, 1981).

One such example is the detailed analysis, and correlating of the senses to the type, amount and quality of information that might be perceived (Malnar & Vodvarka, 2004).

Figure 16 Ranges of the Senses (Malnar & Vodvarka, 2004, p. 151)

As illustrated in Figure 16, the level of perception in turn allows for the understanding, and subsequent interactions of people with, and within the environment. Instead of getting into the details of such established systems,
this research chooses to instead focus on the affordances that they present, and from which an inquiry into how key understandings might be expanded as a means to collectively inventory liminal landscapes and experiences.

Despite the philosopher Gaston Bachelard’s claim that “[S]ight says too many things at one time” (Bachelard, 1958, p. 215), there is no doubting the power of the eye in people’s ability to perceive the environment. Pallasmaa has written about the heavy reliance on sight yet mentions the pleasurable touch of the eye, in particular the potential shadows play in fully exploiting the three-dimensional quality of light (Pallasmaa, 1996).

This reliance of the eye, however, has created a sense of hegemony (Bowring, 2007), where there is a pervasive subjugation by visual preference, rendering experiences of the other senses secondary, or even obsolete. Proponents of the importance of phenomenological experiences reiterate that designing interventions that engage all the senses is not meant to discount the importance of visual appreciation. Rather, it is meant to highlight the importance of the other senses in experiential encounters. This is where, according to these theorists, the attention to phenomenal properties “can present poetic tools for making spaces of exhilarating perceptions” (Holl, 1994, p. 55). To include the types of information obtained through the other senses might rekindle the awareness of the oft-forgotten contributions that these senses bring. Together with the sense of vision, these other senses would cater towards more wholesome experiences of the external world (outside the human body). This concept of experiencing the landscape phenomenologically is found to be of relevance to the framing of the key concepts of my research (Section 2.5).

However, before a more detailed examination into how the other senses might be included in assessments of liminal experiences, it is important to highlight how, in the standpoint of my research, visual acuity might be ‘expanded’ in such appraisals. Hall writes of the eye as not only an information gatherer, but more importantly as one that conveys. Human understanding, according to Hall, occurs when “experience is synthesised” (Hall, 1966, p. 65). When this occurs, a person learns during such ‘seeing’, which in turn, informs and influences what that person sees. This concept is
also considered relevant to the shaping of the key concepts of this research, and is included in the compilation in Section 2.5.

In landscape, such influences might create meanings that set the critical difference between what is perceived as a safe or dangerous space to be in. For instance, spanning across a ravaging river, the presence of a bridge might convey a message of a safe passage. Instinctively, past experiences might subconsciously direct one towards it. However, the focusing on such retinal image might continue to channel the person towards mere walking through the landscape, instead of walking in it. This is where Hall’s differentiation between what he terms as ‘visual field’ or the retinal image, and ‘visual world’. The latter, as explained by Hall (1966), is where a person perceives the world, and as such, ‘images’ needed to be three-dimensional. What this might mean for the landscape designer is that in the designing of interventions, it might also be crucial to consider the surrounding environment, failing which, the opportunity to capture the essence of the site might be missed. Might such sensitivities towards the site as a whole be converted into inventorying, and if so, how might it be achieved?

One possible way is to understand the difference between the much-practised focus of linear perspective against the more-unravelling potentials offered by peripheral and multi-perspectival visions. Linear perspective, argues Hall, creates a forced sense of focus, and eliminates less desirable qualities. By widening the angle of perception, and connecting various ‘vanishing points’, a sense of continuity could be achieved and occlusions might be revealed. Designing with such awareness removes the sense of static ‘viewing’. Instead, what is opened up is the appreciation of the three-dimensionality of landscape. The eye is drawn towards landscape’s multitude of qualities, inviting the person to explore; vigorously encouraging the sense of what has been previously discussed as ‘walking in’.

Multiperspectival vision increases the awareness towards peripheral vision; a sense of awareness of movement within the landscape. The latter is one that dynamically heightens the responsiveness of the ever-changing effects of the elements within the landscape, and indirectly onto the person in that environment. This peripheral perception transforms retinal images into a
spatial and bodily involvement and encourages participation, such that it expands the perceptual realm beyond that one-point focused vision.

Interventions might act as catalysts in this sense of movement, on which the ‘visual’ three-dimensionality of the perceived world might be realised and fully experienced. Deliberately taking the attention away from the one-point perspective of a destination, creating a sense of ‘journeying in’ through connectedness highlights the dynamism of interactions with the environment as one ventures towards that destination.

Might the designing of interventions that encourage involved participation in the exploration of the environment be possible? This encouragement might echo Malnar and Vodvarka’s explanation that the stitching of fragmented ‘views’ through movement forms a “coherent whole” (Malnar & Vodvarka, 2004, p. 104).

This sense of movement, as explained further by Malnar and Vodvarka, brings the discussion back into the richer experiences that a person might encounter through the deliberate focus of engaging the body’s other senses. As part of one physical body, the senses collectively reach a kind of equilibrium that relays a rich and articulated sense of experience to humans. Pallasmaa writes passionately about how “the nose makes the eyes remember” (Pallasmaa, 1996, p. 58), and with such sensorial integration, calls for designs that focus on the drawing out of engagements that evoke multi-sensory experiences.

Encounters that are experienced through such means are known to evoke a more acute sense of emotional reaction. This, according to Malnar and Vodvarka (2004), is due to the body receiving, and constantly adjusting to subtle alterations in haptic information. This, in turn, affects the level of involvement or immersion, as termed by Joseph Pine and James Gilmore, the person has with the environment. Explaining that the various degrees of experiences are related to the type of information and outcome expected, they classify them into four broad categories. Pine and Gilmore conclude
that “the richest experiences encompass aspects of all four realms” (Pine II & Gilmore, 1998, p. 99) (Figure 17).

The landscape designer might find relevance in the thinking of Pine and Gilmore, whose interest lies in the area of experience management, on which memorable events might be orchestrated as a holistic approach with interventions. This concept of experiencing landscape through varying degrees is found to be another important dimension on which the key concepts of my research might be based (see Section 2.5).

Figure 17 Pine & Gilmore’s Four Realms of an Experience

Arguing that such an approach positions memory itself as the product, or the ‘experience’, might the adoption of such strategies in design be a means of directing the ‘seeing’ of past experiences anew? Might this then present an opportunity for the landscape designer to indirectly redefine the sense of ‘travelling the landscape’, akin to how the psychologist Bernd Jager’s distinguishes from the mere “covering of distance” (Jager, 1985, p. 241), more commonly known as tourism? Would landscape designs within liminal landscapes be capable of drawing back out the mystery in the environment; that sense of the vivid?

This resonates with the idea of “the romance of travelling”. In Eva Illouz’s “Romance as Liminality” (Illouz, 1997, p. 142), reference is made to the “the rituals lived during travel!”. Such rituals are considered especially potent because they enable people to withdraw thoroughly from daily routine, work, and social obligations. For Illouz, who examines from the sociological standpoint, travels “take people to the frontier of liminality and are the most
pristine”. It can therefore be argued that instead of leaving liminal, in-between, or leftover spaces as they are, re-defining them through careful insertions of interventions could be a way of re-activating such places as the stage for these “romantic adventures” (Illouz, 1997, p. 142). This ‘re-definition’ might be partly due to the fact that they have often been overlooked, but more importantly for the richness they have from the melding, of their adjacent spaces, that occurs within them. These might be turning points in creating these places anew, possibly even making them endearing.

It is nonetheless important to take note of landscape’s capacity to maintain an endearing and enduring perception in the minds of people. One example is the bestowing of natural stones with highly symbolic meaning. Jaffe, describes how ancient cultures perceive these stones as connections to divine presence. This belief, writes Jaffe, is reflected in daily routines such as their use as boundary lines, and that such reconciliation indicates “a first attempt to invest the stone with more expressive power than chance and nature could give” (Jaffe, 1964, p. 258). The landscape designer might take a leaf from such thinking, but using abstraction might be a more suitable application instead of literally translating it, which might end up with the mere placement of objects.

2.4.2 Embodiment of Landscape

The scope to analyse the interconnectivity of experiencing the landscape through the senses is wide. However, approaching it from the specific angle of where humans are considered not as objects in the environment, but as part of it (Brownell, 2011; Roy, 1981), is considered relevant to this research. In such instances, where the environment is one that surrounds, enfolds and engulfs, humans are understood as participants, and as being part of the environment (Roy, 1981). This, in turn, suggests, as discussed in the previous section, that ‘movement’ is key in the process of exploring landscape as a dynamic state. Movements of the mind, and of the body are situations that would seem to imply a crucial sense in experiencing liminal conditions in landscapes. Being part of the landscape might mean that in inhabiting, and in being embodied in the environment, a sense of duality is created.
The first has been discussed in earlier sections as a form of ‘re-action’, where people and the environment each affect one another.

One clear way to illustrate this standpoint is to understand how Hall (1966) defines distances between people, which leads into his discussions on the dynamism of space, as shown in Figure 18. What is of relevance here is the sense of relationship between the interacting individuals, where the sense of distance affects the level of ‘encroachment’ one is willing to allow, and thus determines how one reacts. This understanding echoes deliberations by the metaphysicist Richard Taylor, who further explains that due to the existence of entities in space, a sense of extension is formed. Distinct spatial boundaries, according to Taylor, are thus defined. Taylor argues that at the same time, entities also become extended in time, and as such, possess temporal boundaries. This same analogy might be applied in the designing of interventions.

![Figure 18](image)

Figure 18 Hall’s Distances in Man (Hall, 1966)

This line of thoughts runs parallel to those of Jager, who in citing Merleau-Ponty, states that the body, house or city, which in my research is referred to as intervention, “when properly inhabited, not merely remains something seen; it itself becomes a source of vision and light according to which we see” (Jager, 1985, p. 218). Such arguments would position interventions to take the form of ‘bodily extension’. This happens where in the process of being used as a means of directing one towards a particular experience in the landscape, a second purpose becomes effected, affording people with a subsequent encounter. Such interventions become a means of enabling the experiencing of encounters that would have otherwise not been possible, ceasing to appear as a mere object or matter in the landscape. Instead, they would transform into an existence with people and the environment.
The example of the viewing platform cited in the section on metaphysical landscapes further elaborates the point here. Having the platform within the landscape serves its first purpose of bringing about a pause. However, having it extended out into the ravine renders it a second function. Used as a base on which one is able to perceive that same view in a different light, the intervention has morphed into an extension of the human body. Figure 19, showing the Grand Canyon Skywalk, with its transparent horseshoe-shaped cantilever bridge, illustrates this point. Situated at an elevation of more than one and a half thousand metres, the sheer vertical drop from its bridge reaches almost two hundred metres. Such a combination, of visual and telluric experiences, could be considered as one that redefines how the landscape is perceived, and encountered.

Figure 19 Photos showing the Grand Canyon Skywalk – the insertion of an artefact (the skywalk) beyond the physical confines of the landscape (the cliff) affords the encountering of a ‘new’ experience (Image from http://www.dailymail.co.uk)
Would a designer be able to design such interventions, where the transferring of human senses beyond the body is akin to what Jager describes as the flooding over of bodily existence into things? Would such design strategies, then accentuate the manifestation of interventions as liminal elements? This concept of ‘bodily extension’ is considered as an important dimension to the framing of the key concepts of my research, and is included in the consolidation in Section 2.5.

Metaphysical understandings have revealed that it is possible to be in two places at one time. Such spatio-temporal concepts, according to Taylor, require that the object, or person, to also be occupying the space in between (Taylor, 1992). Taylor explains through the example of a person standing at the door with one foot inside, while still remaining outside. However, reiterates Taylor, that person has to remain at the threshold for this straddling to take place. Moving towards one means a withdrawal from the other. This might be translated into how the space becomes ‘lived’, a means by which, when applied in the landscape, a sense of ‘internalising’ the landscape could be achieved (Pallasmaa, 1996). The landscape engulfs the person, and all its affordances are unconsciously felt throughout the body. In such ‘internalisation’, of which interventions are considered extensions of the environment, the sense of perception would certainly vary. The designer, however, might still apply strategies, like this concept of ‘internalising’, as a framework in which to evoke intended experiences.

Perception is thus subjective. Tuan, for one, considers landscape as an “ordering of reality” (Tuan, 1979, p. 90). Categorising such orderings into ‘vertical’ and ‘side’ views, Tuan distinguishes the former as the more systemic and objective domain, while the latter encompasses perceptions of the individual, and thus more subjective. Though the perception of the environment varies at many levels, with inferences that range from the cultural to the geographical, what is more relevant to my research is the scale to which one might relate perception. Such straddling, between one to the other, might render perception as having characteristics of being liminal. Hall’s categorisation, based on the growth of awareness, structures people in a series of different perceptual worlds. In explaining, Hall writes of “[m]an’s growing awareness; first of himself, second of his environment, then
of himself and his environment, and finally of the transaction between himself and his environment” (Hall, 1966, p. 90).

This sense of ‘growth’ might be interpreted as the constant re-drawing of the limits of the body; a dynamic sense of inhabitation. Due to this perpetual fluidity, the act of inhabitation might take the form of a liminal entity. The continuous adjustments of artefacts, considered as interventions in the context of my research that act as extensions of one’s embodiment in the landscape, connect the present state to possibilities. Jager equates this to a means of opportunities of embodiment in providing connections to the past and future (Jager, 1985). For the environmental design academic Kimberley Dovey, this connectedness between people and the environment creates a meaningful association between things and the human world (Dovey, 1985). Dovey’s example of how “a pen is for writing” might be translated by the landscape designer as a way where interventions that are designed to be open-ended, allowing for the ‘experiencer’ to be the maker of the ‘experience’. This sense of active and continual engagement might be a way to bring a person into closer contact with the landscape and its element. For instance, a bench might be designed with movable parts in such a way that it could be adjusted by the ‘engager’ to suit a preferred way of maximising the ‘engagement’ of the landscape.

2.4.3 Describing Landscape

Landscapes have been known to inspire poetic expressions for their ‘scene-like’ affordances. This sense of authorship, whether magnified or brought into focus by the choice of the poet’s words or the strokes of the painter’s brush, is already intrinsic in the landscape. It is merely frozen in time, and might be made more ‘human’ through insertions of artefacts that gave a sense of scale or human interactions.

In this day and age, these captured representations include photographs, which of late are outcomes of the high degree of technologically-enhanced resolution, to those of real-time video captures. Whichever is the case, these ‘en-framed points of view’ are still read as a means of representing the power that landscape offers. This power is one that allures
the sense of consciousness, which immediately captures the fusing of physical, cultural, historical, and geographical contexts, all at once.

Another way of ‘looking’ at this lies in the way from which landscapes are perceived by people of different backgrounds. Janet Stephenson describes these as the “touchstones of identity” (Stephenson, 2010, p. 166), where the same landscape and environment are perceived differently by different stakeholders within a community. For Stephenson, a cultural geographer, more important are the meanings landscape brings to each person. As shown in Figure 20 below, the series of drawings and paintings illustrates the perception of landscapes by various group of people. These pictorial depictions indicate the level and extent of the relationships that have been forged with the landscape, from which, various degrees of evocation have been afforded.

Figure 20 A series of ‘pictorial’ depictions of how the landscape is perceived by various people. (Top Left) Drawing by a child (Age 8), (Top Middle) Painting by a child (Age 4), (Top Right) Painting by Diana Adams – Windswept Totara, 2005 (Bottom Left) Painting by Neil Driver – Afternoon Sun, Central Otago, 2006, and (Bottom Right) Painting by Geoff Tune – Tracing the Seasons, Waikane, 2006 (Images from author’s children and (Robinson, 2007, pp. 35, 17, 82))
In another instance, research by Brent Lovelock and Kirsten Lovelock analyses perceptions against assumed givens, providing a window into expectations of what “a sense of arrival” means (Lovelock, Lovelock, Jellum, & Thompson, 2011). Comparing expectations from locals and immigrants, they conclude that not only are landscapes and the environment vastly perceived visually, but the meanings portrayed, and absorbed are actually very much based on culturally-influenced emotions and eidetic memories.

Hall considers language as “patterned reminders” (Hall, 1966, p. 94) on which memories might be released, while the landscape writer Ann Whiston Spirn defines language as a medium that “makes thoughts tangible and imagination possible” (Spirn, 2002, p. 125). Taking the stand that since perceptions are varied across a wide spectrum of interpretations, creating something different and fresh could create a new form of familiarity and perception. The idea lies in allowing landscapes to be re-defined, even though its ambit is still one that straddles from being symbolic to pragmatic. These ‘patterned reminders’ are considered crucial in framing the key concepts of my research, as in Section 2.5.

Would this be where the use of language be pertinent? Adopted as a way to reflect observations and describe new definitions, would such focus on using metaphors, derived from abstract readings of landscape’s elements, be a means of deciphering new connections? Such deciphering might also be relevant in the process of framing the key concepts of my research (see Section 2.5).

Moore considers the importance of the role of language as the final piece of the puzzle when it comes to designing. Explaining that for a complete and comprehensive communication of design ideas, a verbal presentation clarifies and explains the image (Moore, 2010). Moore cites the psychologist Liam Hudson, who argues that “to examine the use of words is to plunge into a muddle, innuendo, ambiguity, fantasy and internal contradiction” (Moore, 2010, p. 148). Moore explains further that narratives hold the power to inspire and show things that one would have otherwise never noticed or knew existed. Would incorporating language as part of inventorying, and in turn,
using it as design prompts, then be a way to overcome intrinsic qualities that could not be captured graphically?

Such strategies might not necessarily imply that memories of the existing landscapes be completely ignored or be wiped away by those of the interventions. Rather, they could serve as another layer on which current readings are based. In fact, they might even be the much-needed punctuations that disentangle knotted depictions that have long been entrenched. Corner refers to such uses of language as yet another layer in the “topographic palimpsest”. Other than the primary purpose of graphically representing possibilities, would it not be liberating for the designer to also be conversant in the language of landscape? Spirn feels it would. She writes, “[T]o know landscape poetics is to see, task, hear, and feel landscape as a symphony of complex harmonies” (Spirn, 2002, p. 128).

This research detects reverberations in Mugerauer’s description of the significance of language in encounters with the world and the environment. Calling such associations “environmental hermeneutics and signs of interpretation”, Mugerauer succinctly writes that “how we describe it, so it reveals to us” (Mugerauer, 1985, p. 52). Reiterating the importance of fitting words through which the environment is able to appear, Mugerauer focuses on the sense of relativity. He cites the writer Samuel Woodworth Cozzens, who considers the manner in which the landscape is described would influence the way it is perceived.

To an extent, language, as a means of perceiving the environment, is not mere labels. Instead, it is a means to scream out exciting possibilities as much as an inscription of meanings. In stressing the importance language plays in connecting the present to memory, Mugerauer aptly gathers such diverse views into an ensemble in saying that words are but “the evocation of what things are and how they are related to other things in the web of particular lives and places” (Mugerauer, 1985, p. 59). Two examples are shown in Figure 21. In these instances, the genius loci and the elements within the site have been made central. It should be noted, however, that due to cultural diversity, language might be equally diverse. As such, certain interpretations might lead definitions astray. Though the use of
dialects might, as Spirn suggests, be one way of relaying precise descriptions, the landscape designer might still benefit from the preparation of a repertoire of referents. This set of tools might build the pace up in creating the ‘un-familiar’ in the designer’s mind. Such inventorying might itself take the form of being liminal.

One thing is certain: that liminal landscapes present opportunities for new meanings. This search for new ways of relating to, and engaging landscapes, in turn, demand a fresh set of tools. From the discussions of the three relevant angles of experiencing the landscape, it becomes clear that they collectively direct towards the amalgamation of the perception of physical space with that of its real-time and metaphysical affordances. Correlating the past and connecting to future possibilities would create a sense of continuity, making each place rich with a unique sense of identity.

Inserting designs that keep re-inventing the concept of the ‘familiar’, creates a sense of continuation; one that is ever-changing, ever-dynamic and ever-

Figure 21 Poems by Edward Thomas (Left) and Graham Lindsay (Right) underscore the importance of the landscape, and its elements, as the words are used as reminders of the level of affiliation and affinity that people have for each location.
engaging. This, in turn, constantly seeks new interpretations, and re-interpretations. In the words of Wylie, landscape is ‘seen’, with this key idea shifting towards the setting up of new ways ‘to see’, taken from the standpoint of both designers, as well as the ‘engagers’ (Wylie, 2007). Both positions are considered equally important. The former, being the ones who inventory and eventually insert the interventions, need to ‘see’ beyond the visual. The latter, being the ‘engagers’ and the ‘experiencers’, would not only feel the landscape and the environment, but would also be the ones experiencing the juxtapositioning of the interventions with, and in them.

In short, what might be intriguing is the opportunity to engage landscape in a new way that allows both designers and people to re-define and re-assess the importance of how different things can be. These might be liminal entities, in the form of tensions between the ideal, where things are perceived visually or through memory. These ‘re-engagements’ might also be the ‘real’, where things are sensed, realised, and comprehended “in-person”, and where the un-familiar could become the ‘new familiar’.

As summed up by Hall, the experiencing of the environment is a source of the much needed excitement and ideas in life, to be found in one’s relationship to the environment, and to oneself (Hall, 1966, p. 186). To which, Seamon and Mugerauer echo that “(W)ith self-conscious understanding and intention, our experiential bonds with the world can widen and deepen. In turn, the environment and the world as experienced can expand in dimensions and meanings” (Seamon & Mugerauer, 1985, p. 5).

2.5 KEY CONCEPTS FOR THE RESEARCH – A COMPILATION

The examination in the previous sections has provided important understandings of the terms considered relevant to my research. Identified dimensions, that are considered important in exploring the idea of liminality in landscapes, have been gradually built up. This section consolidates these dimensions and uses them to frame the six key concepts for my research.

Figure 22 below shows the correlation of the extracted dimensions in unpacking the key concepts. These distilled concepts, in turn, are
considered as a means to succinctly capture and reorganise the understandings of the potential of liminal landscapes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT (OF)</th>
<th>EXAMINED DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Perception</td>
<td>• Sense of “wonder” as a means to see things in themselves (Page 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Genius loci” (Page 61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Seeing’ influences what is ‘seen’ and understood (Page 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Degrees of experiencing (Page 66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Journey-ing In</td>
<td>• Landscape as a “field of possibilities” (Page 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Focusing in’ as a means of ‘opening up’ (Page 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phenomenological experiences (Page 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Embodiment</td>
<td>• Merging of ‘ground’ with ‘figure’ (Page 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experiencing artefact with the environment as one entity (Page 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Immersive ‘re-engagement’ of landscape experience (Page 47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Strategic pause” as a counterbalance (Page 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interventions as ‘bodily extensions’ (Page 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 “Authentic Wholeness”</td>
<td>• “Presencing” and “revealing” (Page 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Landscape parts as “subsidiary clues to an integrated image” (Page 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 “Descriptive Hermeneutics”</td>
<td>• Metaphorical role and symbolic meaning (Page 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language as “patterned reminders” (Page 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language as a means to decipher new connections (Page 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Projection</td>
<td>• Making the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’ (Page 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metaphorical role and symbolic meaning (Page 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Cues” as a means to jolt memories (Page 57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22 Key Concepts – Extracted concepts of the understanding of liminal landscapes

These concepts have been used to form the core on which the next stage of this research is based. They are formulated into a framework used to carry out site analyses in selected case studies. These concepts are meant as a set of guides to assess the relevance and level of effectiveness in identifying and inventorying liminal landscapes. They act as sources of reference for the adjustment and expansion of current inventorying methods, and the addition of ones.

The application of these concepts as a driver to tailor inventorying methods for the purposes mentioned is a means of converting theoretical understandings into praxis in landscape architecture. This application will now be discussed in the next chapter.
The understandings from the key terms are now ready to be tested on case studies. Organised as a set of strategies that determine methods currently used in inventorying processes, detailed inventorying was then done at study sites to test the level of effectiveness of these methods. Inventoried liminal qualities of each site were then referred back to the understandings in earlier discussions. These cross-referencing resulted in the adjustment or expansion of the methods, including the addition of the not-commonly used ones, having now been considered relevant in identifying liminal spaces.

This chapter focuses on employing the six key concepts that were identified in the previous chapter and summarised in Section 2.5. These are organised as a set of guides. They are then tested for their effectiveness and usefulness in identifying liminal spaces and liminal qualities. To do so, a site for conducting case studies is selected, on which a series of inventorying was carried out. These inventorying methods, using tasks considered relevant, are then analysed. These methods, and tasks within each, where found to be insufficient for detailed inventorying of liminal qualities, and were subsequently adjusted and expanded. Additional methods are also added where considered necessary. Collectively, the various methods serve as a
checklist for a detailed and relevant processes of inventorying liminal qualities in landscapes.

The consolidated methods are then further tested as triggers for the designing of interventions within the study sites. Potential areas, spaces, places and elements within the landscape that highlight and afford liminal experiences are converted into design prompts. Interventions are then conceptualised and proposed as a means of testing the potentials of such conversions. The outcomes are then examined, and the resulting analyses distilled to serve as insights into the key concepts discussed within this research. These on-the-ground studies, in turn, suggest possibilities on which such understandings might be adopted into patterns in landscape design praxis, potentially as a means of engaging the landscape in multiple ways.

3.1 OVERALL SITE

As introduced at the beginning of this research on page 2, Rapaki Track [shown here again in Figure 23 below] was identified as a useful site to examine.

Figure 23 Rapaki Track – Straddling the City and the Harbour, and in-between Urban and Rural Zonings
Figure 23 shows how Rapaki Track sits in its peri-urban setting, within the stretches of the Port Hills of Christchurch. Known for its tussock grasslands and rugged outcrops, its form contrasts and straddles the flat Canterbury plains and the city below to the north, and Lyttelton harbour to its south. Home to a variety of flora and fauna, where remnants of podocarp forests create links to the past, it is also the playground for a range of activities. These range from walking and running, to the more adventurous endeavours like paragliding, mountain biking and climbing. Much loved, the Port Hills is part of Banks Peninsula, and boasts a chain of reserves (thirty-nine in total), a series of volcanic domes, and some of the oldest rocks in the peninsula that age millions of years.

Rapaki Track is balanced with valleys, and together with the Crater Rim Walkway, supports regenerating and restored native bush lands that enhance its biodiversity. Due to such bridging, it has become both a foreground and a backdrop for many leisure and scenic activities, as much as being the focus of scientific and academic researches. Commencing at about a hundred metres above mean sea level, Rapaki Track reaches its summit at three hundred and thirty-three metres and within this two hundred and forty-three metres vertical range are three distinctive ecosystems (Lucas, 1997), namely:-

- Rocky Ridge Ecosystem (Plants natural to these high, moist, well-drained, gently sloping, Rapaki soils on volcanic rock)
- Crest & Shoulder Ecosystem (Plants natural to these high, moist but well-drained, gently sloping, Summit soils on loess)
- Rocky Ridge Ecosystem (Plants natural to these mid-elevation, dry, well-drained, gently sloping Cashmere soils on volcanic rock & colluvium).

Sandwiched between, and within close proximity to these are zones of rural housing, intensive farming, natural ecological heritage parks, remnant native forests and conservation land. These allow Rapaki Track to host a range of microclimates and biodiversity, rendering it as the stretch most suited for explorative inventoring and intervention insertions.
3.1.1 Determining the Specific Study Sites

The focus of this research is to identify key qualities in liminal landscapes. To do so, a set of methods are proposed to carry out the inventorying of characteristics that were both explicit and lay hidden. These qualities are then analysed in terms of the liminal qualities they might identify and/or generate.

To begin this process, initial inventorying was carried out at the sites. Methods considered relevant for such applications were ones based on careful ‘observation’ and recording, and are namely:-

- **Photo-taking**
  - One-point ‘perspectives’ and vantage points
  - Zoom-in on spaces and elements that are of interest

- **Sketching and Diagramming**
  - Sketching spaces of interest to extract the essence
  - Diagramming of circulation and adjacent connections

- **Exploring Physically**
  - ‘Walking the ground’ to establish peculiarities and specificities of the sites, and recorded in notes, photographs and diagrams

3.1.1.1 Applying, Analysing and Evaluating the Tasks within the Methods

These methods were applied onto Rapaki Track, resulting in the identification of five distinct threshold points; each becoming designated study sites in which the respective case studies were conducted. However, the above methods were considered insufficient in the fully uncovering of specific liminal characteristics that were present within the identified sites. For instance, in photographing single images, the attention seemed to focus on either only a particular vantage point, or on the ‘capturing’ of ‘the scene’. This approach restricted the inventorying of the sense of continuity, and of ‘journeys’ and ‘journey-ing in’ that was identified on page 77. Another shortfall in utilising the listed tasks is the ‘mere photographing’ of textures. It was considered a more tactile ‘reminder’ might be more useful in accentuating special characteristics and ephemeral effects of the textures. The photographs, still considered useful, should generally operate as supporting methods.
Another drawback, of how the initial methods of inventorying were found to be inadequate, is how they place a heavy focus on the ‘physical site’. This created a tendency to be easily pulled into a sense of analysing, and eventual designing parts of the track, in isolation. In reality, sites do not exist as disjointed, standalone entities. They are connected and interrelated to a macro context. For example, an adjacent site, potentially rich in historical significance, one that could drive the designing of interventions that draw connections over to the subject site, might easily be overlooked.

3.1.1.2 Adjusting and Expanding the Methods and Tasks

It was therefore considered crucial that the tasks, used widely in most inventorying exercises, needed to be adjusted and expanded. Other tasks, which had not been included were also considered. They took on complementary roles, but are nevertheless important. In particular were those which emphasised the importance of ‘continuing’ the inventorying process beyond the sites. Off-site inventorying, in the form of researching for archived records and subject interviews, are important. For example, as consolidated in Section 2.5, they reveal symbolic meanings, hidden metaphorical connections, untold stories, culturally-linked affinities and affiliations, and even future, projective plans.

Figure 24 to Figure 33 on the following pages tabulate the various methods and tasks that have been adjusted, expanded and added to the inventorying process. The methods correlate to the six key concepts identified in Section 2.5 on page 77, with each method applied to all five sites - within and outside, and at their threshold edges. They have collectively created a more encompassing and detailed set of inventories. Each method was then analysed, evaluated and compared to the initial inventorying methods. This process became a point of comparison, where a more sophisticated level of inventorying and analysis was achieved.
Figure 24 and Figure 25 illustrate how the method of photo-taking has been adjusted and expanded. Compared to how it was initially used, the changes have resulted in ways of using photo-taking as a means to reveal hidden points that show a series of connections sequences, and accentuating specific and detailed elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD 1 (BEFORE)</th>
<th>PHOTO-TAKING - INITIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>One-Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To highlight One-point ‘perspectives’ and vantage points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD 1 (AFTER)</th>
<th>PHOTO-TAKING - ADJUSTED AND EXPANDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>One-Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To highlight vantage points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS (Page 77)</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Journey-ing In</th>
<th>Journey-ing In</th>
<th>Perception, Journey-ing In, Embodiment and “Authentic Wholeness”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE A</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE B</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE C</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE D</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24 Adjusted and expanded Method 1 (Photo-taking)
**METHOD 1 (PHOTO-TAKING)**

**BEFORE (INITIAL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single, 'one-point perspective' shot taken at a 'favourable distance'.</td>
<td>Photo-taking “expanded” to include panoramic shots as a means to show connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Using a static photographing technique)</td>
<td>Zoomed-in shots are meant to show effects of natural processes acting on the landscape elements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site E (One-point)</td>
<td>Site E (Multi-points through panoramic shot to show spatial connections and continuity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site E (Zoomed-in shots around the site to show effects of natural processes onto the site)</td>
<td>(Maximising the functions of the camera in photographing panoramic and digital zoom, but set against a backdrop of the site as scale and textural comparisons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 25** Examples to explain the outcome of the adjusted and expanded Method 1 (Photo-taking)
Figure 26 and Figure 27 illustrate the extent to which the methods of sketching and diagramming were adjusted and expanded. The initial focus was on a two-dimensional assessment of the layout, coupled with a three-dimensional sketch of any element of interest. The re-adapted version includes a more integrated three-dimensional assessment, where the diagrammatic sectional studies might create a better appreciation of spatial connections. In particular, they support a need to detect liminal qualities that straddle in-between spatial thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD 2 (BEFORE)</th>
<th>SKETCHING AND DIAGRAMMING - INITIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>Layout, Circulation and Elements of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sketching spaces of interest to extract the essence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Diagramming of circulation and adjacent connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD 2 (AFTER)</th>
<th>SKETCHING AND DIAGRAMMING - ADJUSTED AND EXPANDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>Layout and Elements of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To indicate spatial and movement flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS (Page 77)</td>
<td>Perception, Journey-ing In and Embodiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE A</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE B</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE C</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE D</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE E</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26 Adjusted and expanded Method 2 (Sketching and Diagramming)
**METHOD 2 (SKETCHING AND DIAGRAMMING)**

### BEFORE (INITIAL)

Simple, two-dimensional plane of circulation spaces.

(Using on-site diagramming and off-site computer analysis)

### AFTER (ADJUSTED AND EXPANDED)

Basic diagramming ‘expanded’ to include on-site sectional studies of aspect extension and spatial expansion.

Off-site three-dimensional computer-generated studies included to better comprehend spatial connections.

(Using on-site sketching and diagramming, and off-site computer analysis and simulation)

---

**Figure 27** Examples to explain the outcome of adjusted and expanded Method 2 (Sketching and Diagramming)
Figure 28 and Figure 29 illustrate that the tasks spelt out in the initial method have been made more specific. This was done to ensure a much fuller engagement of the human body and its senses in appreciating the landscape. This increased the sensitivity towards the subtle changes in the landscape, in particular those that were visibly obscured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD 3 (BEFORE)</th>
<th>EXPLORING PHYSICALLY - INITIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>Layout, Circulation and Elements of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Walking the ground’ to establish peculiarities and specificities of the sites, and recorded in notes, photographs and diagrams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD 3 (AFTER)</th>
<th>EXPLORING PHYSICALLY - ADJUSTED AND EXPANDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>Moving around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To heighten kinaesthetic sensitivities and ephemeral effects like the presence of fallen twigs due to seasonal changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Page 77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey-ing In, Embodiment, “Authentic Wholeness” and Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey-ing In, Embodiment, “Authentic Wholeness” and Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey-ing In, Embodiment, “Authentic Wholeness” and Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey-ing In, Embodiment, “Authentic Wholeness” and Projection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE A</th>
<th>SITE B</th>
<th>SITE C</th>
<th>SITE D</th>
<th>SITE E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28 Adjusted and expanded Method 3 (Exploring Physically)
## Method 3 (Exploring Physically)

**Before (Initial)**

‘Walking the ground’ to establish peculiarities and specificities of the sites, and recorded in notes, photographs and diagrams.

(Physically walking into the landscape, instead of just standing from one vantage point)

**After (Adjusted and Expanded)**

The task of ‘Walking the ground’ expanded to specifically direct researcher to inventory the understanding of the landscape’s elements through the act of touching, hearing and smelling.

The deliberate ‘shutting off’ of the eyes allowed focusing on the other senses like the nose and ear, allowing for heightened noticing of subtle nuances.

(Physically walking in, instead of just standing from one vantage point, and spending extra time to encounter the landscape’s elements up close)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site B (From one vantage point)</th>
<th>Site B (Showing opposite direction to analyse spatial continuity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site B (Zooming in on evidence of people’s engagement with the site beyond designated spaces)</td>
<td>Site B (Zoomed-in shots of elements and spaces discovered from the venturing off the track into adjacent spaces around the site)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sound and Video Recordings – a record of the sounds of prevailing fauna and strength of natural elements like wind and water that could hint of the forces present at the site)

**Figure 29** Examples to explain the outcome of adjusted and expanded Method 3 (Exploring Physically)
Figure 30 and Figure 31 summarise the outcome of a method not initially considered in the inventorying process. Collecting samples, rubbings and the tracing of overlays were found to be a better ‘reminder’ of the textural qualities of the landscape. Being three-dimensional, the researcher might be easily and instantly be reminded of the tactile nature of the elements. Not restricted to just physical objects like stones and leaves, this method included the rubbing of textures on tracing paper, on which the effects of light and shadow were juxtaposed on – acting as a record of the presence of the ephemeral. These focus on elements on the micro scale. Trace overlays, referring to the outlining of features on a macro scale. Printed photographs were drawn with a thick marker, outlining specific features, both embedded and ephemeral, in particular those that exist in between distinct zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD 4 (AFTER)</th>
<th>COLLECTING - ADDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples</td>
<td>To act as reminders of varying scales, colours, scents, types and textures of entities (noting fresh state and aged state)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbings</td>
<td>To act as reminders of varying scales, types and textures of entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace Overlays</td>
<td>To unravel visually-hidden elements that are affected by presences and absences of ephemeral entities like light and shadow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS (Page 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journey-ing In, Embodiment, “Authentic Wholeness” and Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey-ing In, Embodiment, “Authentic Wholeness” and Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey-ing In, Embodiment, “Authentic Wholeness” and Projection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Rubbings</th>
<th>Trace Overlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE A</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE B</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE C</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30 New addition - Method 4 (Collecting)
METHOD 4 (COLLECTING) - ADDED

AFTER

Textures collected range from physical objects to tracings and rubbings. Spanning various scales, the tasks within this method recorded both embedded and ephemeral elements, and the effect each had on the landscape.

(Using on-site physical collection and paper rubbings, and off-site trace overlays of printed photographs)

Various Sites (Samples collection to act as scale and textural reminders)

Various Sites (Trace overlays to highlight specific elements – natural and manmade – that create connections to the landscape, and create impact on the perception of the sites)

Figure 31 Examples to explain the outcome of newly added Method 4 (Collecting)
Figure 32 and Figure 33 illustrate the outcome of another method that was not initially included in the inventorying process. Meant as a means of extracting meanings and connections beyond the physicality of the sites, this method inventoried specific linkages to the past, and future proposals. These can act as prompts for the designing of interventions. For example, these extractions might come in the form of symbolic meanings, hidden metaphorical connections, untold stories, and culturally-linked affinities and affiliations; even future, projective plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD 5</th>
<th>RESEARCHING RECORDS - ADDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>Narratives, Stories, Historical Records, Current and Projected Policies &amp; Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To find and discover connections to the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To understand existing and current rationales and justifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To understand past and existing descriptions of affinities and affiliations, in particular symbolic references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To understand future projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To learn about potential effects of landscape’s temporal dimensions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS**

(Page 77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE A</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE B</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE C</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE D</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE E</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32 New addition - Method 5 (Researching Records)
Information within the study sites, and of adjacent sites were unravelled. Examples range from areas of historical significance, and long-term future macro-scale planning proposals. These provided a better and clearer understanding of the connections beyond the physicality of the study sites.

(Using on-site searching of elements and/or spaces of relevance, derived from researches done both pre- and post- off-site inventorying)

Witch Hill Memorial (Bates, 2009) – Existing adjacent to one of the study sites

Plan of Christchurch City – Showing Proposed Ecological Walkway around Perimeter of the City (Young, 2014), of which, Rapaki Track is a part

Figure 33 Examples to explain the outcome of newly added Method 5 (Researching Records)
3.1.1.3 Summary of Adjusted and Expanded Methods (and Corresponding Tasks or Techniques)

Figure 24 through Figure 33 are explanations as to how current inventorying methods could be adjusted and expanded in order to specifically unravel liminal characteristics of landscapes. These explanations serve to illustrate that none of the suggested methods are new. Methods 1, 2 and 3 are each, sensible ways of inventorying a site – ones that would be adopted by any person who would be seeking for clues as a means of understanding it. Methods 4 and 5 are possible ways in which current inventorying methods could be complemented. It is suggested here instead, that these current and sensible methods could be made more detailed and focused. The intention here is that, with such specific tasks and techniques within each method, the identification of liminal characteristics of landscapes would be made more apparent.

Now that the purpose (and usage) of such detailed adjustments and expansion of current tasks and techniques have been established, the next crucial step is to relate them to each of the six extracted key concepts. Tabled in Section 2.5, they have been extracted from the literature review of the potential of liminal landscapes (Chapter 2). The correlation, summarised in Figure 34 below, explains the interrelationships which were then used to carry out detailed inventorying and analysis of each of the study sites. The application of the methods is discussed in the next section, through the detailed analysis of one threshold point as an example. The exemplar, in turn acts as a means of testing the effectiveness and relevance of the tasks and techniques in inventorying liminal qualities and characteristics in the landscape. This is a way, as earlier explained in the Research Strategy (Figure 5, on page 12), of connecting the theoretical framework to practical approaches, directly explaining why existing inventorying methods and techniques might miss the opportunity of identifying such qualities and characteristics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY CONCEPTS</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHOTO-TAKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEPTION</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNEY-ING IN</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBODIMENT</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHENTIC WHOLENESS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTIVE HERMENEUTICS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECTION</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 34 Correlating methods to theoretical understandings of liminal landscapes
3.2 THE FIVE THRESHOLD POINTS

The application of the methods throughout Rapaki Track identified five threshold points, as shown in Figure 35 below. Stretching throughout the track, each varies in terms of the elevation they are situated in, and the ecosystem in which they are situated. These variations in turn, resulted in the ‘observing’, noticing and recording of the various affordances that each site presented. The outcomes of the inventorying of Site E (Threshold Point 5) are explained and illustrated in detail below, while the summary of the other four sites are tabulated in the Appendices.

![Figure 35 Sectional Elevation](image)

3.3 DETAILED ANALYSIS OF ONE THRESHOLD POINT (AS AN EXAMPLE OF APPLICATION ON A CASE STUDY)

Site E (Threshold Point 5) is used as an example of the application of the methods. Through the process of inventorying, many liminal qualities within and around it were identified. The qualities were also found to span scales, from the elements that constitute its make-up, to ones that are part of a future master plan.
3.3.1 Site E (Threshold Point 5) – Description

As earlier shown in Figure 35, Site E sits at the summit of Rapaki Track, crossing the historic Summit Road. Its vantage point makes it the crossroad between the city and the harbour, in terms of how it might be visually perceived. Being at the summit also makes it exposed to the elements, of which, the presence of strong winds creates a major impact to the experiencing of the space. A three-dimensional computer-generated drawing, of the terrain around Site E, taken off Google Earth and inserted into a modelling software, clearly shows the topographical influences that created such a perception (Figure 36). The site is in between areas zoned as rural living and intensive farming. It is also a connection point of public conservation lands and natural ecological heritage parks, where public accesses in terms of walking and biking routes are embedded. Adjacent to it is Witch Hill, where a war memorial is situated. Due to the recent earthquake activities, rocks crumbling off the surface of the hill could be detected encroaching into Site E, altering its character and, and affecting the affordances it presents.
3.3.2 Site E (Threshold Point 5) – Inventory and Analysis

Figure 37 to Figure 40 below and in the next few pages tabulate the understanding of the key concepts identified in Section 2.5 on page 77. These are the result of the outcomes of the adjusted, expanded and added methods of inventorying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERSTANDING OF LIMINAL QUALITIES THE LANDSCAPE IN SITE E - REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS (Page 77)</th>
<th>METHODS USED IN INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTCOME</strong></td>
<td><strong>METHOD 1 (Photo-taking)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panoramic shots show peripheral and multi-perspectival points – capturing spatial connectivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDENTIFIED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS &amp; CORRELATED KEY CONCEPTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ “Genius loci” (Page 61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Authentic Wholeness”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ “Presencing” and “revealing” (Page 33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Landscape parts as “subsidiary clues to an integrated image” (Page 53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Descriptive Hermeneutics”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Metaphorical role and symbolic meaning (Page 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Making the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’ (Page 40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTCOME</strong></td>
<td><strong>METHOD 2 (Sketching and Drawing)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site diagramming and sketching, complemented by off-site 3D computer graphics analysis – creating a dynamic study of spatial extensions and expansions between and across zones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDENTIFIED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS vis-a-vis CORRELATED KEY CONCEPTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Degrees of experiencing (Page 66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Journey-ing In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Landscape as a “field of possibilities” (Page 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ ‘Focusing in’ as a means of ‘opening up’ (Page 48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Authentic Wholeness”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ “Presencing” and “revealing” (Page 33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Making the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’ (Page 40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 37** Inventorying of Site E (Threshold Point 5) – Correlated to Key Concepts
OUTCOME
On-site recording that involved moving around, and deliberate ‘shutting off’ of the eyes allowed the focusing in of elements and effects that would have otherwise been missed due to the ‘visual noises’. Examples include the noticing of the strength of the wind, the textural and ever-changing make-up of the landscape, and the scents and smells of animals and vegetation.

Further exploration also revealed the ‘hidden’ ephemeral water body – a pond. Other than the obvious purpose of supplying water to the animals, it might also present an opportunity to ‘bring in’ spaces beyond the site by functioning as a reflector. Existing barriers were noted as being part of the landscape, as a means of understanding and ‘reminding’ of the nature of porous boundaries – the keeping out of animals, but the allowing ‘in’ of people and vegetation.

IDENTIFIED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS vis-a-vis CORRELATED KEY CONCEPTS

- **Perception**
  - Degrees of experiencing (Page 66)

- **Journey-ing In**
  - Landscape as a “field of possibilities” (Page 18)
  - ‘Focusing in’ as a means of ‘opening up’ (Page 48)
  - Phenomenological experiences (Page 64)

- **Embodiment**
  - Immersive ‘re-engagement’ of landscape experience (Page 47)

- **Projection**
  - Making the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’ (Page 40)

Figure 38 Inventorying of Site E (Threshold Point 5) – Correlated to Key Concepts (continued)
UNDERSTANDING OF LIMINAL QUALITIES THE LANDSCAPE IN SITE E - REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS (Page 77)

METHODS USED IN INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

OUTCOME
Samples, rubbings and trace overlays are complemented by the collection of sound and video recordings of sounds and ephemeral changes. Sounds of the winds, for example, might act as reminders of the tenacity one might be exposed to in such an open space. Likewise, records of shadow might provide cues to the intensity of light and heat at specific spaces. Collected physical materials on the other hand, might act as cues to the various scales and textures that are embedded in the landscape.

IDENTIFIED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS vis-a-vis CORRELATED KEY CONCEPTS

- Perception
  - “Genius loci” (Page 61)
  - Degrees of experiencing (Page 66)
- Journey-ing In
  - Landscape as a “field of possibilities” (Page 18)
  - ‘Focusing in’ as a means of ‘opening up’ (Page 48)
  - Phenomenological experiences (Page 64)
- “Authentic Wholeness”
  - “Presencing” and “revealing” (Page 33)
- Projection
  - Making the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’ (Page 40)
  - “Cues” as a means to jolt memories (Page 57)

METHOD 4 (Collecting)

Figure 39 Inventorying of Site E (Threshold Point 5) – Correlated to Key Concepts (continued)
OUTCOME

A combination of off-site research with on-site verifications formed a ‘wholesome’ set of linkages beyond the physical site. This amalgamation might prove useful for the designer as a means of connecting interventions within a range of physical and temporal scales.

IDENTIFIED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS
vis-a-vis CORRELATED KEY CONCEPTS

- Perception
  - “Genius loci” (Page 61)
  - Degrees of experiencing (Page 66)

- Journey-ing In
  - Landscape as a “field of possibilities” (Page 18)
  - ‘Focusing in’ as a means of ‘opening up’ (Page 48)
  - Phenomenological experiences (Page 64)

- “Authentic Wholeness”
  - “Presencing” and “revealing” (Page 33)

- “Descriptive Hermeneutics”
  - Metaphorical role and symbolic meaning (Page 22)
  - Language as “patterned reminders” (Page 74)
  - Language as a means to decipher new connections (Page 74)

- Projection
  - Making the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’ (Page 40)
  - “Cues” as a means to jolt memories (Page 57)

METHODS USED IN INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

METHOD 5 (Researching Records)

Witch Hill Memorial (Bates, 2009)
- Existing adjacent to one of the study sites
  (Example of records relating to the past)

Land Zoning (Christchurch City Council, 2014)
(Example of records relating to the present)

Plan of Christchurch City – Showing Proposed Ecological Walkway around Perimeter of the City (Young, 2014), of which, Rapaki Track is a part
(Example of records relating to the future)

Figure 40 inventorying of Site E (Threshold Point 5) – Correlated to Key Concepts (continued)
3.4 SUMMARY OF METHODS AND IDENTIFIED ATTRIBUTES

The case studies, of which, Site E (Threshold Point 5) has been shown in detail, illustrate how the sites were examined. Using the set of adjusted, expanded and added methods, key features that demonstrate liminal characteristics were thoroughly recorded and analysed. The methods are summarised here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>CURRENT TASKS &amp; TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>ADJUSTED, EXPANDED &amp; ADDED TASKS &amp; TECHNIQUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>METHOD 1 PHOTO-TAKING</td>
<td>• One-point</td>
<td>• Peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Zoom-in</td>
<td>• Multi-perspectival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHOD 2 SKETCHING &amp; DIAGRAMMING</td>
<td>• On-site Layout, Circulation and Elements of Interest</td>
<td>• On-site Sections (of the Land &amp; Elements of Interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Off-site Computer Simulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHOD 3 EXPLORING PHYSICALLY</td>
<td>• On-site Layout, Circulation and Elements of Interest</td>
<td>• Moving around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• With eyes closed:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Touching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Smelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHOD 4 COLLECTING</td>
<td>• On-site</td>
<td>• On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Samples</td>
<td>• Samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rubbings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trace Overlays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Trace Overlays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHOD 5 RESEARCHING RECORDS</td>
<td>• Off-site</td>
<td>• On-site &amp; Off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Current Policies and Plans</td>
<td>o Narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Projected (Future) Policies and Plans</td>
<td>o Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Historical Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Current Policies and Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Projected (Future) Policies and Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 41 Summary of Methods (and Tasks & Techniques)

The use of these methods has therefore raised awareness of these qualities, which are both physical and metaphysical. As mentioned in Section 3.1.1, in order to fully respond to the key concepts of the research (outlined in Section 2.5), current inventorying methods are found to be insufficient. The
tasks and techniques have to therefore be adjusted, expanded and added in order to carry out a more thorough set of investigations – both on- and off-site. Within the five established sites, experiences of liminal encounters vary, ranging from the intrinsic, ready to be unravelled, to the explicit. These qualities become apparent as affordances, or manifest as physical elements. They, in turn, become potentials to act as design prompts during the inception of design strategies, ones that could create experiential richness. In carrying out the tasks and techniques, certain attributes within the case study sites, have been discovered. These qualities allow the landscape to afford experiential opportunities within them. They present the potential to unravel the intrinsic and liminal capabilities that these sites could offer, acting as design prompts for the designer. These key attributes, collectively indicating the varying levels of affordance that landscapes could offer, are summarised here:

- Visual Experience
- Non-Visual Experience
- Sense of Movement
- Physical Characteristics
- Narratives
- Metaphysical Affordance

Using these attributes in the designing of interventions could allow for ‘translations’ of the sites. These ‘fresh’ experiences are ones that could result in the fostering of a new or a deeper sense of engagement between people and the landscape. As mentioned in Section 1.5, they have the potential to steer the transformation of familiar landscapes to settings that are ‘new’ or ‘un-familiar’. These ‘freshly perceived’ settings could, in turn, be filled with potential to ‘de-familiarise’ familiar activities, creating a renewed sense of engagement.

It can therefore be argued at this stage of my research that being equipped with a proper and thorough set of methods is paramount for the inventorying of liminal qualities within the landscape. Understandings gained from the case studies have set a direction towards the formulation of a framework to organise such methods, ones that could unravel and inventory the established key attributes. The next chapter discusses this articulation, correlating each back to the established key concepts for my research (in Section 2.5).
The case studies illustrate and summarise that through proper inventorying, a robust identification of liminal qualities within landscapes is possible. The studies also suggest that when extracted during such processes, the essence of these elements might be used as design prompts. Being specific to each site, these characteristics form a collective sense of the *genius loci* (as discussed on page 61). Using elements found within the locality might create a continuum, discussed in earlier sections as “authentic wholeness”, where landscape parts become subsidiary clues to the integrated whole (page 53). This, in turn, might affect how the landscape is perceived, ranging from a sense of “wonder” as a means to see things in themselves (page 52) to affording people with various levels of experiencing (page 66).

Interventions that utilise landscapes to collectively act as the backdrop, set the pace, silence the ‘noises’, or bring into focus the sense of ‘departures’ for contemplative thoughts beyond the physical spaces, might be conceptualised from cues discovered during such proper inventorying. For example, designs that are crafted as part of the landscape might create a sense of embodied presence, as discussed on pages 24, 32 and 69.
Through nuanced ‘reminders’ (page 74), either from the presence of interventions, or due to the absence of the ‘present’ (page 33), the creating of a richer level of experience might be possible. As discussed on page 47, this might be achievable through interventions that steer people towards deeper immersion into the landscape.

All these maintain the key argument set out in this research that the landscape designer needs to have a rich palette with which he or she could use to create as rich and as engaging experience as possible. Acknowledging that such combinations of inherent and visible qualities are necessary for the understanding of, and the designing in liminal landscapes, a set of methods that specifically amalgamate such inventorying is therefore crucial. Condensed into a toolkit, it should not only be a means of informative ‘mapping’ of the site. Rather, it might prove to be equally valuable and effective to the designer should it be converted as design prompts and used as a robust and deeply engaging set of design guidelines. Such understandings attest to the magnitude of its possibilities, and will be discussed further in the next section. The discussion culminates with a proposal of a toolkit.

4.1 IDENTIFICATION OF GAP IN THE DISCIPLINE (BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE)

The issues raised, and conclusions arrived at, have reiterated and reinforced the argument of the potential that liminal experiences or ‘in-between’ spaces do create richer experiences of landscape - both physically and metaphysically.

The key concepts (Section 2.5) seem to have demonstrated that it is possible to develop a typology of such experiences, where in this research, the case studies were used as a testbed. The key concepts also became a way of confirming the possibility that theoretical positions could indeed be translated into practice. However, such understandings seem to point towards the need for holistic ways of understanding, ones that rely on more collaborative strategies from inventorying right through to the designing of
interventions. For liminal experiences to be realised, the capacity of the landscape to afford such experiences needed to first be fully understood. This understanding might be achieved through the inventorying of as many qualities of the landscape as possible. This inventorying needs to include, where considered inherent, qualities that remain hidden beyond the physicality of the site. The uncovering, and eventual insertion of such qualities into interventions might contribute to a richer level of engagement between people and the environment.

Though a full review of the potential of liminal landscapes is not possible within the scope of this research, nonetheless, an associated methodology for inventorying can be proposed. This would allow for the explicit identifying and recording of these liminal qualities. In short, the research has identified the need for a toolkit, one that places equal importance to the inventorying of the hidden qualities with those that record physical site conditions. A common practice at present is the focusing on one process (inventorying) or the other (designing) at any one time. This might be considered as a gap in the discipline. An amalgamated process, such as the one highlighted in this research, might be one way to address this gap between understandings of literature and practice.

Figure 42 Research and Thesis Structure – Highlighting the part of this research where the iterative processes of reading Key Concepts against case studies are situated
The iterative processes of reading the analysis carried out in the case studies against the distilled key concepts (page 77) are considered crucial for coming at such an amalgamated process. These processes are shown in Figure 42 and prove to be an important stage within the research. They suggest that the methods within the constructed toolkit need to be equipped with attributes and emphases that identify these liminal spaces.

Five methods have been explored and established in the previous chapter (summarised in Section 3.4 on page 102) to collectively be capable of inventorying liminal spaces and liminal qualities in landscapes. In the same section, six attributes of landscape’s affordance have also been identified.

At this stage, my research finds it important that these methods and attributes be tied back to the established key concepts of this research (Section 2.5, page 77) as a way of bridging theoretical understandings to practical applications. The relationship and relevance that these methods, attributes and concepts act on each other are tabulated and shown in Figure 43 to Figure 48 on the following pages. Cross-referenced to each other, they are meant to act as a summarised set of tasks and techniques, that in the carrying out of inventorying, guide the designer towards particular emphases. This set presents a tailored attempt to elaborate and improve current sets of inventorying tasks to specifically tease out liminal characteristics in landscapes.
## ATTENTION TO TASKS & TECHNIQUES

### WHAT EXACTLY CAN BE DONE TO UNRAVEL LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LANDSCAPE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>WHAT QUALITY CAN BE IDENTIFIED?</th>
<th>EMPHASIS</th>
<th>WHAT TO PAY ATTENTION TO?</th>
<th>TASKS &amp; TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| VISUAL EXPERIENCE | One-point Perspectival Point | - Focus on a particular (vantage) point and/or physical element in the landscape  
- Record the visual interest within the site  
- Record any significant visual interest from beyond the site (adjacent/beyond)  
- Print the photographs and do trace overlays with a thick marker, highlighting distinct lines of features that exist in between zones | i) | ii) Peripheral Vision and Multi-perspectival Space | - Focus on a particular point and/or physical element in the landscape  
- Slowly look around 360 degrees to identify for immediate relationship (adjacencies) to that one point  
- Walk around that one point to identify any visual occlusion  
- Identify connections that lead into, are within, and lead out from the site  
- Print the photographs and do trace overlays with a thick marker, highlighting distinct lines of features that exist in between zones | ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| | Ephemerality (Effects and Timeframe) | - Record (video & sound) temporal contrasts (within the site, experienced within the site but originating from adjacent sites, and within the site but causing effects on adjacent sites), like:-  
  - Seasonal and daily changes  
  - Passing natural elements (Rain, Snow, Wind, Heat from Sun, Light & Shadow)  
- Print the photographs and do trace overlays with a thick marker, highlighting distinct lines of features that exist in between zones | ✓ ✓ ✓ |

**Figure 43** Tasks and methods that could be employed to emphasise landscape’s attribute to afford Visual Experience

Figure 43 shows how the application of a few methods, each with specific tasks, might be crucial in inventorying the potential of experiencing landscapes visually. Varying degrees of perspective points could be pivotal in creating a sense of spatial connections and continuity. Ephemeral qualities could also be emphasised, connecting the physical space with natural processes that have shaped its form.
**Figure 44** Tasks and methods that could be employed to emphasise landscape’s attribute to afford Non-Visual Experience

Figure 44 tabulates the focus on connecting of the various methods to identify and inventory non-visual experiences. These experiences are considered crucial as a means to encounter landscapes through the activation of the other senses.
Figure 45 Tasks and methods that could be employed to emphasise landscape’s attribute to afford experiences of the Sense of Movement

Figure 45 shows the emphases that could be investigated during on-site inventorying of landscape’s affordance of the sense of movement. This attribute is considered important as it allows for the three-dimensional appreciation of the site. Spatial connections and continuity could be experienced through constant negotiations with the physical forms of the site, through which, hidden meanings and references might be uncovered.
### Attributes, Emphasis, Tasks, Techniques, Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Tasks &amp; Techniques</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Physical Characteristics | i) Form   | - Measure (by rough gauge) particular physical elements and/or feature in the landscape, and record the:  
  - Shape: individually and relative to one another, especially  
  - Size: at points of overlaps  
  - Identify thresholds of zones & look for:  
    - Distinct changes in ecosystem  
    - Variations in vegetation at edges of distinct demarcations | Photo, Taking, Sketching & Diagramming, Exploring, Collecting, Researching Records |
|                    | ii) Make-up| - Stop, look, feel & record landscape elements, focusing on:  
  - Texture (Smoothness/roughness)  
  - Strength (Softness/hardness)  
  - Size & scale  
  - Condition (Fresh & dried)  
  - Repeat the above-listed process, this time focusing on man-made elements/objects | Photo, Taking, Sketching & Diagramming, Exploring, Collecting, Researching Records |
|                    | iii) State/Condition | - Take note of:  
  - Action of natural forces & climate onto the landscape  
  - Ecological impact  
  - Ecological diversity  
  - Repeat the above-listed process, taking note of how different time scales have affected the conditions | Photo, Taking, Sketching & Diagramming, Exploring, Collecting, Researching Records |

**Figure 46** Tasks and methods that could be employed to emphasise landscape’s attribute to afford experiences through its Physical Characteristics

Figure 46 illustrates the focus on the physical characteristics of the site. To carry out such inventories, the application of almost all of the methods are considered necessary. Expected outcomes vary from ones that are recordable within the site, to ones that require inventorying at broader scales. The range expected might also span time scales that are varied from shorter (daily or seasonal) to longer and/or irreversible temporal frames.
### Table: Tasks and methods for emphasizing landscape’s attribute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>EMPHASIS</th>
<th>TASKS &amp; TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARRATIVES</td>
<td>I) Historical</td>
<td>At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that are linked to historical significance to different groups of people</td>
<td>PHOTO-TAKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated</td>
<td>SKETCHING &amp; DIAGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II) Interpretation &amp; Stories</td>
<td>At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that are linked to socio-cultural significance of different groups of people</td>
<td>EXPLORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated</td>
<td>COLLECTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pay attention to how language is used to describe and relay these interpretations</td>
<td>RECORDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 47** Tasks and methods that could be employed to emphasize landscape’s attribute to afford experiences of its hidden Narratives

Figure 47 lays the correlation between the methods that need to be employed to the unravelling of historical, current and future plans. The focusing in of this attribute could act as a reminder to the more hidden (from the physical state of the site) qualities of the landscape. The inventorying of these narratives might be less straightforward as it involves different and varied interpretations of the same landscape, as it focuses on concerns, affiliations and/or affinities different groups of stakeholders might have.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>EMPHASIS</th>
<th>TASKS &amp; TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **METAPHYSICAL AFFORDANCE** | **i) Sense of Place** | • At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that create a sense of place and/or highlight the genius loci  
   • Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated  
   • Focus on how these are of significance to different groups of people | ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] |
| | **ii) Symbolism** | • At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that are of symbolic significance and meaning  
   • Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated  
   • Focus on how these are of significance to different groups of people, in particular, how these visual & mental perceptions create a link to thoughts beyond the site’s physicality  
   • Pay attention to how language is used to describe and relay these interpretations | ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] |

Figure 48 Tasks and methods that could be employed to emphasise landscape’s attribute of its Metaphysical Affordances

Figure 48 shows how all the methods might be utilised to extract the essence of the site by searching for traces or hints of the genius loci and how these might in turn have been used to create symbolic connections. Targeted outcomes of such inventories could range from meanings extracted from physical references, to ones that have long been ingrained to cultural perceptions.
The six tables shown in the previous pages (Figure 43 to Figure 48) illustrate the correlation between ‘Attributes’ that can be identified in landscapes, and ‘Methods’ that are considered relevant and useful in the process of recognising liminal spaces and liminal qualities in landscapes.

Particular ‘Emphases’ of each ‘Attribute’, determined as essential in the identifying of such qualities, are highlighted. This process of detection is carried out using the ‘Methods’, which in turn prescribe specific ‘Tasks’ that could be carried out both at the site, and off it.

This sense of interconnectedness between understandings of theoretical positions to practical applications can be considered as the bridge that is crucial to develop clearer understandings of the concepts of liminality in landscapes.

The next section takes this conceptual idea (of the spanning between theory and ‘real life’ application) into a form that could be employed as a practical set of tools.

### 4.2 PROTOTYPING – METHOD CARDS

The tables of methods and tasks explained in the previous section consolidate the understandings distilled within the research. However, for a practical application, these tables can be formatted into a simpler and more user-friendly form. A set of method cards, modelled after IDEO Method Cards (IDEO, 2014) as shown in Figure 49 to Figure 60 (full set is inserted in Appendix J1 to Appendix J16), are one means of embodying the research. They collectively act as:-

- A consolidation and amalgamation of theoretical understandings, tested through a case study, and packaged as a quick and comprehensive guide
- A set of liminal element that opens up awareness towards landscape’s ‘hidden’ qualities and values
### TASK

- Focus on a particular (vantage) point and/or physical element in the landscape
- Record the visual interest within the site
- Record any significant visual interest from beyond the site (adjacent/beyond)
- Print the photographs and do trace overlays with a thick marker, highlighting distinct lines of features that exist in between zones

---

**Figure 49** Example of Front Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Visual Experience
Figure 50 Example of Reverse Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Visual Experience
ATTRIBUTE: Non-Visual Experience

Emphasis: Hapticity (Touch)

Task:
- Stop, look, feel & record particular elements in the landscape:
  - Texture (Smoothness/roughness)
  - Strength (Softness/hardness)
  - Size & scale
  - Condition (Fresh & dried)
- Repeat the above-listed process, this time focusing on the relative juxtapositions of the elements onto each other, in particular at the edges of distinct demarcations.

Figure 51: Example of Front Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Non-Visual Experience
Figure 52 Example of Reverse Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Non-Visual Experience
**ATTRIBUTE**
SENSE OF MOVEMENT

**EMPHASIS**
KINAESTHETIC

**TASK**
- Explore by walking (in, over, under and around) the site and record the way the body is constantly adjusted to:-
  - Negotiate the terrain
  - Manoeuvre around the spatial encroachment of vegetation
  - Discover special features within the landscape
- In particular, be aware of the positioning, repositioning & moving of the parts of the body activated by the physical changes at the edges of distinct demarcations

*Figure 53* Example of Front Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Sense of Movement
Figure 54 Example of Reverse Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Sense of Movement
ATTRIBUTE: PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

EMPHASIS: MAKE-UP

TASK:
- Stop, look, feel & record landscape elements, focusing on:
  - Texture (Smoothness/roughness)
  - Strength (Softness/hardness)
  - Size & scale
  - Condition (Fresh & dried)
- Repeat the above-listed process, this time focusing on man-made elements/objects

Figure 55 Example of Front Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Physical Characteristics
Figure 56 Example of Reverse Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Physical Characteristics
At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that are linked to historical significance to different groups of people.

Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated.

**Figure 57** Example of Front Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Narratives
Figure 58 Example of Reverse Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Narratives
At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that create a sense of place and/or highlight the genius loci.

Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated.

Focus on how these are of significance to different groups of people.
Figure 60 Example of Reverse Side of Method Card for (the Attribute) Metaphysical Affordance
4.3 DISCUSSION – METHOD CARDS

The method cards form a toolkit with which the landscape architect might use to run a full inventory process to identify liminal spaces and liminal qualities of landscapes. Guided by the key concepts for the research (Section 2.5, page 77), the tasks within each method have been established to respond to the theoretical understandings of the earlier examined key terms.

These methods, earlier tested on the case studies, have revealed qualities within the landscapes considered relevant to the understandings of the concept of liminality. Summarised into six key attributes in Section 3.4 on page 102, these characteristics have been established as key drivers in determining the emphases that needed to be focused on during such inventorying.

What resulted are the expanding of the methods into detailed tasks that needed to be carried out in order to identify such attributes at the sites. Simplified and formatted into separate cards, the methods in this toolkit are meant as a set of checklist and reminders that would not only guide the researcher at site, but could also act as prompts during the designing of interventions.

As mentioned in Section 1.5, the focus of this research has been more on the generation of the prototype toolkit. Going one step further, the research has used the identified characteristics as design prompts in the conceptualising of interventions for each of the case study sites. Acting as a means of testing the possibilities of these qualities in transforming the current state or ‘familiar’ landscapes into ‘new’ or ‘un-familiar’ settings, the interventions have been assessed in their capabilities of creating ‘freshly perceived’ settings. They have also been examined further in their ability to create a renewed sense of engagement. However, as explained, since this next stage, of designing and testing its outcome, is not the focus of this thesis, and is thus not expressly detailed in this thesis, it is attached only as a source of reference in the Appendices.
5  DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1  CONCLUSION

The following conclusions can be derived from this research and are outlined below.

The first finding is the importance of ‘viewing’ landscapes from a wider scope. This expanded ‘view’ presents a more thorough understanding of landscape’s close relationship to people through the forms of perception, interpretation and adoption into the realms of the social, cultural and psychological. As examined from the dimensions of ‘seeing’ as a means of influencing what is ‘seen’ and understood (page 64), and of language as a means to decipher new meanings (page 74), the varying perceptual understanding could act as cues for the landscape architect. These prompts range from recorded narratives like poems, songs and stories, to visual perceptions that evoke reminders of such connections like photographs, paintings and drawings.

Second, teasing apart of landscape’s values is also of relevance. The concept of projection, of landscape’s capacity to encourage contemplative departures beyond the present state, as discussed on page
22, is another important finding. Shaped by the perception that people have, in particular with references to past experiences, such projections focus on the metaphorical roles and symbolic meanings that landscapes possess.

Such ‘references’ can be considered as the ‘softer side’ of landscapes in evoking rich experiences and engagements between people and the environment. A sense of ‘journeying in’ needs to be evoked. As examined on page 48, such ‘focusing in’ can act as a means of ‘opening up’, on which, perceptions can be varied and altered. Discussed on page 66 as a way of encountering varying degrees of experiences with landscapes, such dimensions can also be linked to the possibilities of ‘projection’. This resonates with the discussion on page 40, where the idea of making the ‘invisible’ visible has been considered an important finding.

Third, is that the theoretical understanding of the concept of liminal spaces in landscapes can be derived through adaptations of thinking in other artistic disciplines is acknowledged as another important aspect. These include the designing of artworks and artefacts as expressions of intertwined relationships. This can be related back to the research’s identification of interventions can be considered as ‘bodily extensions’ into the environment. As discussed on page 69, this approach is a way of embodying elements as part of the landscape experience. This runs parallel to the concept of “authentic wholeness” (page 53), where the idea of landscape parts as “subsidiary clues to an integrated image” is akin to the one teased out on page 32. In the latter, the concept of embodiment was considered to be of relevance, as the dimension of experiencing inserted artefacts as one entity with the environment was examined and considered a valuable insight.

Fourth, the focus of this research has been on acknowledging the importance of liminal landscapes to design, and a key finding is the value that landscapes have in the evoking of ‘fresh’ or ‘unfamiliar’ experiences within ‘familiar’ spaces. This can be achieved through a design strategy that constantly seek to ‘see’ things anew. This sense of perception, discussed on page 52, focuses on the sense of ‘wonder’ as a means to ‘see’ things in themselves. Other than using landscape elements to act as ‘cues’ to jolt
memories (page 57), such strategies can also ‘reveal’ fresh interpretations of otherwise ‘un-noticed’ or ‘mundane’ things in the landscape. This sense of “presencing”, discussed on page 33, is another valuable insight.

Fifth, in the process of establishing the inventorying methods, this research has reinforced the importance of connecting haptic and visual mechanisms to form a holistic perceptual system. This all-encompassing system, in turn, encourages and facilitates an encountering of immersive experiences. Such experiences can be considered as another means of ‘journeying in’, though discussed from another standpoint (page 64), where the idea of engaging all senses for a ‘phenomenological experiences’ is a valuable finding. This can be read in tandem with the discussions on page 47, where the concept of embodiment has opened insights into immersive ‘re-engagements’ of landscape experiences.

Finally, developing a prototype toolkit has created another awareness. Such prototyping can be a relevant and useful future research methodology; for example its use as a module in landscape architecture design courses. Taking the form of method cards, the toolkit becomes a quick and practical guide to assist designers, and stakeholders, in recognising liminal landscapes. This recognition, in turn, could further act as prompts during the conceptualising and designing of interventions. Closely linked to the examined concepts of ‘projection’ in landscapes, the idea of making the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’ (page 40), together with that of using landscape elements as ‘cues’ to jolt memories (page 57), can be employed to ‘realise’ such theoretical understandings into practice. Collectively, these findings can reiterate and reinforce the sense of ‘journeying in’, where the landscape is considered as a “field of possibilities” (page 18).

To summarise, the six conclusions have collectively explained how landscape could play a part in enabling more engaging interactions with people. Examples of such possibilities range from the designing of programmes that allow for the experiencing of the landscape as it evolves, to ones that inject strategies that could encourage user interventions as landscapes change, allowing a mere space in the landscape to be experienced ‘afresh’, even as ‘places’ or settings.
It has also been acknowledged that spaces could carry more meanings than being just a physical space, thus, creating potentials of generating fresh or new meanings into spaces in landscapes. Such acknowledgements have been explained as being possible through the insertion of liminal elements as physical as well as ‘atmospheric’ reminders.

Such testing of possibilities is how this research has been framed, through the investigation of how current states or ‘familiar’ landscapes could be transformed into ‘new’ or ‘un-familiar’ settings. It has also examined how, being in a liminal state or being exposed to liminal elements, could allow for the ‘de-familiarising’ of familiar activities, en route to having a deeper and renewed sense of engagement with landscapes.

5.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH

Within the context of this research, the toolkit has been crafted and sequenced to act as a means of guiding the landscape architect at the two key stages of landscape design: the inventorying of the site and the designing of interventions. Tested in case studies that run the methods and tasks through varying scales, the toolkit is the result of applying current inventorying methods that have been adjusted, expanded and added on. These series of fine-tunings were specifically done to act as a channel that could seek out liminal spaces and liminal qualities in landscapes. Such guides could also act as design prompts during the conceptualisation of interventions.

The toolkit operates as an accompaniment to the already much practiced method of assessing and analysing sites and projects using established techniques of visualisation like sketching, photographing and diagramming. The attributes and emphases within the framework of the toolkit are considered as a way of exercising embodied processes.

The toolkit approach runs parallel to Pallasmaa’s thinking when he stresses the importance of a more complete way of assessing; one that complements, not replaces, the reliance on visual assessments. He writes
that “(t)he prevailing educational philosophies regrettably continue to emphasise and value conceptual, intellectual and verbal knowledge over the tacit and non-conceptual wisdom of our embodied processes” (Pallasmaa, 2009, p. 22). To this, Smith echoes that these processes act as a means to tacitly inform the richness in opportunities, by bringing to surface phenomenal characteristics of the site. Citing Pallasmaa, Smith writes,

...the sensuous, the haptic and the imaginary are overwhelmed by the visual and digital...digital integration into architecture has opened up a vast new medium of imagination, but it should be an adjunct to the design process and not the sole focus of and preliminary engagement with design... (2010, p.26)

Using Smith’s writing on Pallasmaa, this research has relied on a strategy that is akin to those that have been highlighting the potential of rich inventorying through the engagement of all senses. Such detailed levels of inventorying could, in turn, become prompts in the designing of interventions. In this research, the possibility of such a conversion has been tested. Defined as ‘Design Exploration’, the extracted qualities within each site have been converted as design prompts. These are termed as ‘Identified Design Opportunities’, as shown in Appendix A1 through Appendix E3. They are then used to act as cues in the designing of interventions, as illustrated and explained in Appendix F1 through Appendix F16.

Outcomes from the research findings support the creation of more conducive and immersive engagements of the environment, with rural, urban and peri-urban landscapes being all part of this environment. This research illustrates that through an overarching process of inventorying, fresh adaptations of liminal spaces can create new forms of landscape design language. As such, this may provoke fresh means of adapting an environment that could, in turn, act as catalysts for new types of spaces.

One way such an outcome might be useful is as a means of testing and presenting new experiences to a familiar setting and event. This could contribute to an extension of current knowledge within the discipline. Driven by a focus on spaces that are in-between, the importance a setting plays as a backdrop for events and festivals can be reconsidered through the re-
using or re-adapting of places that are marginal. By current definition, the marginal might come in the form of leftover spaces, pockets of vacant spaces due to demolition, and patches or corridors that line the edges between the city and peri-urban spaces.

From a practice-based point of view, a new design objective can emerge. This can highlight the potential that new forms of public activity and event spaces, designed primarily as a landscape space, can have on the environment, of which, the urban fabric is part. This suggests an extension of that fabric into wider, adjacent context. Since such new forms of participatory landscapes rely on people’s involvement and ‘re-actions’, such outcomes can create new understandings of using the landscape. One way is the use of landscape as a key driver in urban renewal as a strategy in connecting and rejuvenating urban voids, leftover spaces, or abandoned spaces.

Such directions lead to better understandings of landscape that result in the encountering of landscapes that are rich in meanings due to the melding of interactions of people in the landscape. Consequently, landscapes can become more valuable to a wider range of people, reinforcing landscape-and-culture’s much intertwined dimensions.


### APPENDIX A1

**Consolidation of Inventorying for Site A (Threshold Point 1)**

#### UNDERSTANDING OF LIMINAL QUALITIES THE LANDSCAPE IN SITE E - REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS

**Page 77**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRELATED KEY CONCEPTS</th>
<th>METHODS 1 TO 5 COLLECTIVELY USED IN INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Genius loci” (Page 61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Degrees of experiencing (Page 66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journey-ing In</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Focusing in’ as a means of ‘opening up’ (Page 48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phenomenological experiences (Page 64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embodiment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Strategic pause” as a counterbalance (Page 49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interventions as ‘bodily extensions’ (Page 69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Authentic Wholeness”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Presencing” and “revealing” (Page 33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landscape parts as “subsidiary cues to an integrated image” (Page 53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Descriptive Hermeneutics”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Language as “patterned reminders” (Page 74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Language as a means to decipher new connections (Page 74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Making the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’ (Page 40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED DESIGN OPPORTUNITIES (FROM INVENTORYING OF LIMINAL SPACES & LIMINAL ELEMENTS)

- The filtering light and the sense of enclosure afforded by the twin rows of shelter belts of pine trees create a dramatic entrance into the hills, which is relatively bare, bright and exposed.
- A design intervention intended to capture the essence of moving out of the threshold by accentuating the zone of transition might be possible, by semi-enclosing a stretch, thereby continuing the experiencing of porosity.
- Another interesting possibility is the introduction of an exaggerated sense of perspective; a means of bending time, through the attention given to pieces of an otherwise dead piece of the landscape, like for example, dead tree trunks.
## APPENDIX A2

Design Exploration for Site A (Threshold Point 1)

### INVENTORY (OF EXTRACTED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of potentials identified during site analysis</th>
<th>Design Exploration for Site A (Threshold Point 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Enclosure &amp; Darkness (Concept of Perception)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Refuge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Translucency &amp; Filtering (Concepts of Perception &amp; Projection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Prospect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transition (Concepts of Embodiment, Authentic Wholeness &amp; Projection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Exploration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Spatial Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Reflecting Forward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Reflecting Back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Reflecting Forward &amp; (Upcoming Exposure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESIGN INTERVENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it covered, When it was used, How it was used</th>
<th>Design Exploration for Site A (Threshold Point 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Where participants might:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Be exposed to the encountering of elements of one threshold in another</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learn or be aware of certain phenomenon of effects of the landscape from the experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- E.g. landscape effects due to the actions of natural elements like weather conditions or geological movements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Be absorbed in such understandings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To use when:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Needing to highlight qualities of the landscape that are beyond just visual and immediately physical (metaphysical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Needing to project the subliminal qualities of what the landscape stands for, through association to meanings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can be used to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Highlight movements across thresholds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus attention to particular or peculiar qualities of the elements in the landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key design concepts (to highlight liminal characteristics of landscape)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extensively applied as a tool to encounter liminal experience of:</th>
<th>Design Exploration for Site A (Threshold Point 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ephemerality of landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changing characters of landscape elements through the seasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effects of ephemeral factors on landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How the landscape is changed due to external factors (E.g. wind &amp; water)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historical events that occurred within the landscape:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How the landscape forms or formation allowed for certain activities (E.g. as a route between one part of the land to the other)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nature of landscape as a “provider”:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landschaft character of landscape (E.g. source of timber and shelter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A3
Design Exploration for Site A (Threshold Point 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN INTERVENTION</th>
<th>Detail design to achieve intended liminal experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embedded Intervention</strong></td>
<td>A series of bare trunks placed on either side of the track, from densely placed to sparsely spaced out, echoing and continuing the ‘march’ of existing shelter belt in the adjacent zone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To heighten the sense of departure (from an enclosed space, of the existing shelter belt, into a more translucent spatial dimension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To evoke a sense of spatial expansion and extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To heighten existing level of porosity (of light)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To increase awareness of temporal dimension (fading colours of the trunks - changes in time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To elicit contemplations into the landscape’s (and life’s) sense of fragility (bare, but presence of hard, dried branches – a sense of duality of sturdiness and fragility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ephemeral Intervention</strong></td>
<td>A series of wind vanes in the form of loosely-tied fabric placed at top of bare trunks (of embedded design intervention) in the form of swivelling panels of fabric:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To heighten the sense of openness; exposure to the elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To heighten awareness of the ephemerality of the elements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of understanding of liminal experiences and/or liminal landscapes examined through design work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embedded Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sense of Perception, Embodiment, Authentic Wholeness, Descriptive Hermeneutics and Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ephemeral Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sense of Perception, Journeying and Projection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX B1**

**Consolidation of Inventoring for Site B (Threshold Point 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERSTANDING OF LIMINAL QUALITIES THE LANDSCAPE IN SITE E</th>
<th>METHODS 1 TO 5 COLLECTIVELY USED IN INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORRELATED KEY CONCEPTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED DESIGN OPPORTUNITIES (FROM INVENTORY OF LIMINAL SPACES &amp; LIMINAL ELEMENTS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perception</td>
<td>• Amidst the open, long and winding stretch of the track, a silent oasis awaits. Experienced as a breathing lung, it offers the potential as a visual rest with its lush green-ness, and an opportunity to explore the seductive landscape it shelters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Degrees of experiencing (Page 66)</td>
<td>• Obviously well-trampled, as observed from the well-beaten off-track, creating another possibility for a design intervention that seeks to further encourage this spirit of gallivanting. Rocks from the locality, could be laid as meandering, explorative lines that lead to nowhere. These in turn might encourage one to continue discovering one’s own niche, or a place of contemplation, amidst the richer biodiversity that this moister, cooler and enclosed area offers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Journey-ing In</td>
<td>• “Authentic Wholeness”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Landscape as a “field of possibilities” (Page 18)</td>
<td>➢ Landscape parts as “subsidiary cues to an integrated image” (Page 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Phenomenological experiences (Page 64)</td>
<td>• Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embodiment</td>
<td>➢ Making the “invisible” ‘visible’ (Page 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Immersive ‘re-engagement’ of landscape experience (Page 47)</td>
<td>• METHODS 1 TO 5 COLLECTIVELY USED IN INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ “Strategic pause” as a counterbalance (Page 49)</td>
<td><strong>SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED DESIGN OPPORTUNITIES (FROM INVENTORY OF LIMINAL SPACES &amp; LIMINAL ELEMENTS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Authentic Wholeness”</td>
<td>• Amidst the open, long and winding stretch of the track, a silent oasis awaits. Experienced as a breathing lung, it offers the potential as a visual rest with its lush green-ness, and an opportunity to explore the seductive landscape it shelters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Landscape parts as “subsidiary cues to an integrated image” (Page 53)</td>
<td>• Obviously well-trampled, as observed from the well-beaten off-track, creating another possibility for a design intervention that seeks to further encourage this spirit of gallivanting. Rocks from the locality, could be laid as meandering, explorative lines that lead to nowhere. These in turn might encourage one to continue discovering one’s own niche, or a place of contemplation, amidst the richer biodiversity that this moister, cooler and enclosed area offers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B2
Design Exploration for Site B (Threshold Point 2)

### SITE B (THRESHOLD POINT 2) – FROM INVENTORY TO DESIGN

#### INVENTORY (OF EXTRACTED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of potentials identified during site analysis</th>
<th>• Enclosure &amp; Darkness (Concept of Perception)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Sense of Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Sense of Refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Translucency &amp; Filtering (Concepts of Perception &amp; Projection)</td>
<td>➢ Sense of Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Sense of Prospect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transition (Concepts of Embodiment, Authentic Wholeness &amp; Projection)</td>
<td>➢ Sense of Exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Sense of Spatial Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Sense of Reflecting Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Sense of Reflecting Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Sense of (Upcoming Exposure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DESIGN INTERVENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it covered, When it was used, How it was used</th>
<th>• Where participants might:-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Experience touch, heightened contact &amp; kinaesthetic reminders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Through the natural and instinctive activation the immediate receptors and muscles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To use when:-</td>
<td>➢ Experiencing the landscape at a closer range or when being led into smaller spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Activating kinaesthetic and haptic functions due to site conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be used to:-</td>
<td>➢ Accentuate site conditions that are prevalently spatially tighter (E.g. meandering in existing native vegetation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Encourage negotiation within the tight space by touching and constant adjusting of bodily movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Highlight movements across thresholds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key design concepts (to highlight liminal characteristics of landscape)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>• Extensively applied as a tool to encounter liminal experience of:-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Desire to know the unknown; exploration of spaces beyond thresholds; beyond what is “allowed” or “official”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Unravelling of the diversity of the ‘hidden’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Design Intervention

**Embedded Intervention**
- The meandering of path that leads into thick vegetation within a highly undulating terrain
  - To highlight the importance of a path as a liminal element that affords engagement beyond what would be within the people’s threshold of comfort
  - To awaken the haptic senses of the body for a more inclusive and all-encompassing bodily experience

**Ephemeral Intervention**
- A series of fabric installations, placed horizontally at strategic heights, with placement of lights that allow for the shadow play of the trees onto the fabric
  - To create a sense of movement, the element in the fourth dimension, through the absence of light (or the dance of the shadows)
  - To highlight the importance of light as a liminal element, and its effects, onto the landscape (and people’s engagement with it)

### Aspect of understanding of liminal experiences and/or liminal landscapes examined through design work

**Embedded Intervention**
- Sense of Perception, Journeying, Embodiment and Authentic Wholeness

**Ephemeral Intervention**
- Sense of Perception, Journeying, Embodiment, Authentic Wholeness and Projection
## APPENDIX C1
### Consolidation of Inventorying for Site C (Threshold Point 3)

### UNDERSTANDING OF LIMINAL QUALITIES THE LANDSCAPE IN SITE E - REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS

(Page 77)

### CORRELATED KEY CONCEPTS

- **Perception**
  - “Genius loci” (Page 61)
  - ‘Seeing’ influences what is ‘seen’ and understood (Page 64)
  - Degrees of experiencing (Page 66)
- **Journey-ing In**
  - Landscape as a “field of possibilities” (Page 18)
- **Embodiment**
  - Merging of ‘ground’ with ‘figure’ (Page 24)
  - Experiencing artefact with the environment as one entity (Page 32)
  - Immersive ‘re-engagement’ of landscape experience (Page 47)
  - Interventions as ‘bodily extensions’ (Page 69)
- **“Authentic Wholeness”**
  - Landscape parts as “subsidiary cues to an integrated image” (Page 53)
- **Projection**
  - “Cues” as a means to jolt memories (Page 57)

### METHODS 1 TO 5 COLLECTIVELY USED IN INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

### SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED DESIGN OPPORTUNITIES (FROM INVENTORYING OF LIMINAL SPACES & LIMINAL ELEMENTS)

- The presence of a few things denotes this zone, in the form of both naturally-formed as well as human-made elements, highlighting the Landschaft nature of the landscape.
- The presence of continued, though currently remnant-looking bands of vegetation, seem to give clues as to where areas that are more fertile might be located. Joining them as a means of connecting the hills are the towering electrical cables, spanning valleys and rising above the ridges. These present a potentially interesting idea as a way of addressing their collective significance, of utilising landscape’s treasures, in our daily lives.
APPENDIX C2
Design Exploration for Site C (Threshold Point 3)

SITE C (THRESHOLD POINT 3) – FROM INVENTORY TO DESIGN

INVENTORY (OF EXTRACTED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS)

Summary of potentials identified during site analysis

- Extension & Expansion (Concepts of Journey-ing In, Embodiment, Descriptive Hermeneutics & Authentic Wholeness)
  - Sense of Reflection-Landschaft
    - The Working Land
    - The Providing Land
  - Sense of Reflection-Visual
    - Intensified Line
  - Sense of Reflection-Physical
    - Connection
- Transition (Concepts of Embodiment, Authentic Wholeness & Projection)
  - Sense of Continuation

DESIGN INTERVENTION

What it covered, When it was used, How it was used

- Where participants might:
  - Be unexpectedly faced with a feeling of vividness; of something that would be remembered clearly
  - Be suddenly overwhelmed with a feeling of the sublime; of the metaphysical, through a sense of connection with the environment, and through mental projections of the past and future

- To use when:
  - Feelings of high emotions; of being in harmony with the settings and environment are required
  - Wanting to create a sense of realism beyond the physical present; beyond the person, but through the feeling that the environment is more than real

- Can be used to:
  - Create a place/space of quiet moment for reflection
  - Create a sense of awe in the landscape from the understanding of its make-up, affordances and linkages to historical significance
  - Heighten the experience of being in the liminal zone by being at one place (physically) yet transported (consciousness) beyond and feel emotions not that of the physical space itself

Key design concepts (to highlight liminal characteristics of landscape)

- Extensively applied as a tool to encounter liminal experience of:
  - The concept of meandering into the land, discovering hidden diversity
  - Evoking of a sense of physical and visual re-orientation, and of the metaphysical by creating a shallow “platform” of indented ground. Ponding water transforms into a mirror, reflecting landscapes which are beyond the site, allowing for an understanding that transcends what can be physically grasped. Acting also as the central focus, the “platform” becomes a liminal element, connecting the road, track, walkway, farms and adjacent peaks. On the macroscale, it connects the City in the North of the Harbour in the South, a reminder of historical linkage.
## APPENDIX C3

### Design Exploration for Site C (Threshold Point 3)

#### SITE C (THRESHOLD POINT 3) – FROM INVENTORY TO DESIGN (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN INTERVENTION</th>
<th>Embedded Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Detail design to achieve intended liminal experience | - The sense of ecological impact on the environment, directly affecting the make-up of the terrain and landscape, is adopted as a design strategy, through a proposal that engages a long-term re-forestation of native, endemic vegetation  
   - To highlight a link between natural processes with experiences within the landscape  
   - To create an understanding of the temporal element on which landscape is closely-knitted to, through the insertion of interventions that span decades, even centuries, to evolve |

| Ephemeral Intervention | A play of ribbon-like fabric that meanders in and out, that weaves up and down and around the plants in the ribbon corridor (of the embedded design intervention)  
   - To capture the close relationship people have with landscapes |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of understanding of liminal experiences and/or liminal landscapes examined through design work</th>
<th>Embedded Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Perception, Journeying, Embodiment &amp; Authentic Wholeness, Descriptive Hermeneutics and Projection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ephemeral Intervention | Sense of Perception, Journeying and Embodiment |
APPENDIX D1
Consolidation of Inventoring for Site D (Threshold Point 4)

**UNDERSTANDING OF LIMINAL QUALITIES THE LANDSCAPE IN SITE E**
- **REFERENCE TO KEY CONCEPTS**
  (Page 77)

**CORRELATED KEY CONCEPTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Sense of “wonder” as a means to see things in themselves (Page 53)</th>
<th>&quot;Genius loci&quot; (Page 61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journey-ing In</td>
<td>“Focusing in’ as a means of ‘opening up’ (Page 48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embodiment</td>
<td>Immersive ‘re-engagement’ of landscape experience (Page 47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Authentic Wholeness”</td>
<td>“Presencing” and “revealing” (Page 33)</td>
<td>Landscape parts as “subsidiary cues to an integrated image” (Page 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Making the ‘invisible’ ‘visible’ (Page 40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED DESIGN OPPORTUNITIES (FROM INVENTORYING OF LIMINAL SPACES & LIMINAL ELEMENTS)**

- The open-ness of the site is accentuated by a long, gradually-rising slope up to Summit Road, where it is eventually greeted by the towering Witch Hill and Mt Vernon. One of the key characteristics of this site is the evidence of many valleys on both its adjacent sides. What is more evident as a result is the presence of lusher and bigger vegetation along these valley lines, giving a hint that the presence of ephemeral streams might be supporting a more thriving growth of flora and fauna – a potential design driver.
- What might also be a potential is the exaggeration of the beautiful, nature-formed lines by means of regeneration of endemic tussocks, accentuating the lines even more. This understanding, that the soils of the hill are well-supported - a natural erosion preventive measure, might generate another design response that create a sense of awareness of such natural processes.
APPENDIX D2
Design Exploration for Site D (Threshold Point 4)

### SITE D (THRESHOLD POINT 4) – FROM INVENTORY TO DESIGN

#### INVENTORY (OF EXTRACTED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of potentials identified during site analysis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Open-ness (Concepts of Perception, Journey-ing In &amp; Embodiment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Sense of Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Sense of Prospect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural-ness (Concepts of Embodiment &amp; Authentic Wholeness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Sense of Natural Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Sense of Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transition (Concepts of Embodiment &amp; Authentic Wholeness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Sense of Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DESIGN INTERVENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it covered, When it was used, How it was used</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Where participants might:-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Be made to feel close to the environment; physically and metabolically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Experience a sense of connection with the environment or landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To use when:-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Wanting to highlight certain elements within the landscape in evoking ecological consciousness through noticing and heightened contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be used to:-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Highlight special features of the landscape like colour, particular plant types, quality of water or source of water, and (dramatic) topography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key design concepts (to highlight liminal characteristics of landscape)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Extensively applied as a tool to encounter liminal experience of:-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Ecological connections between people, flora and fauna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Ephemeral elements of the landscape (E.g. streams), from which ecosystems thrive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Amplified effects (E.g. changing direction &amp; strength of the wind)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ The concept of exploration (E.g. of walking in the land and into the terrain beyond what have been “prepared for” i.e. the track)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ The sense of educating and creating awareness of the specificity or distinctive features of adjacent sites, which may be visually hidden yet within the same land (and landscape) make-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D3
Design Exploration for Site D (Threshold Point 4)

SITE D (THRESHOLD POINT 4) – FROM INVENTORY TO DESIGN (Continued)

DESIGN INTERVENTION

**Detail design to achieve intended liminal experience**

- **Embedded Intervention**
  - The planting of native plants like grasses and shrubs along the valleys, starting from the saddles where neighbouring hills meet, with plants that are endemic to the moister and sheltered zones of the hills, deliberately crossing lines of ephemeral streams
    - To create a sense of the continued presence of landscape’s engagement with the terrain, within which, other forms of ecological systems that are as a collective existence, create a sense of balance to people and the environment

- **Ephemeral Intervention**
  - A playful placement of flexible reeds along the planted valleys, each reed pasted with a light absorbing, luminescent strip, which could be “charged” by torches of “engagers” (for varying levels of light intensity)
    - To heighten the sense of open-ness (of the grasses and shrubs) yet of a balanced human scale
    - To create a sense of awareness of the intense ephemerality of the open space (E.g. exposure to winds)

**Aspect of understanding of liminal experiences and/or liminal landscapes examined through design work**

- **Embedded Intervention**
  - Sense of Perception, Embodiment, Descriptive Hermeneutics and Projection
- **Ephemeral Intervention**
  - Sense of Perception and Embodiment
### APPENDIX E1

**Design Exploration for Site E (Threshold Point 5)**

#### SITE E (THRESHOLD POINT 5) – FROM INVENTORY TO DESIGN

##### INVENTORY (OF EXTRACTED LIMINAL CHARACTERISTICS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of potentials identified during site analysis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-ness (Concepts of Perception, Embodiment &amp; Projection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Sense of Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Sense of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Sense of Extended Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition (Journey-ing In, Embodiment, Authentic Wholeness, Descriptive Hermeneutics &amp; Projection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Sense of Exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Sense of Spatial Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Sense of Juxtaposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### DESIGN INTERVENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it covered, When it was used, How it was used</th>
<th>Where participants might:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Be encouraged to explore wider, and more informal space and scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Instinctively activate distant receptors – eyes, ears and nose (E.g. the experience of distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Experience of the sense of open-ness (E.g. spatial expansion and extension)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| To use when: |
| · The open-ness of the landscape offers possibilities for contrasting experiences and exposures, be it suddenly or gradually |
| · Taking advantage of the expansiveness of the landscape to allow for engagements at a bigger scale as contrasted to smaller-scaled spaces |

| Can be used to: |
| · Insert interventions of varying scales and textures that create an overall area of rich experiential encounters |
| · Play with varying degrees of visual openness and blockages in one specific location within the overall site to create that sense of spatial expansion |
| · Create an understanding that even with boundaries, that sense of continuity or endless connections to the land (and landscape), are inherently present; a means of highlighting landscape’s capability in evoking feelings in the realm of the metaphysical |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key design concepts (to highlight liminal characteristics of landscape)</th>
<th>Extensively applied as a tool to encounter liminal experience of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Highlights the crossing of many physical thresholds (road to path to farm, city to rural, open sea to harbour, plains to summit, flat land and dramatic cliffs, stable and crumbling, near and far and beyond) in which crossing of metaphysical thresholds might be contemplated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Highlights the subtlety of the presence of water, and its impact on the land (and human)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Amplifies the effects of natural elements (wind – changing direction &amp; strength, light – intensity, and sound – naturally, and from the impact of two elements – wind and fabric)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E2
Design Exploration for Site E (Threshold Point 5)

SITE E (THRESHOLD POINT 5) – FROM INVENTORY TO DESIGN (Continued)

**DESIGN INTERVENTION**

**Detail design to achieve intended liminal experience**

- **Embedded Intervention**
  - A “platform” where re-orientation happens at a point, bounded in place with landscape elements that are present within its locality. Within it, simple “scatterings” of location markers (of “hidden” features of the landscape beyond the immediacy of the site), each with a QR Code stamped on it meant to spatially expand these features (with information and/or narratives of such places)
  - The “platform”, with part of its surface indented to the ground, acts as a rainwater collection element, which with a thin layer of ponding water, transforms into a “phenomenal lens”. This transforms into a liminal element, affording the:-
    - Expansion of space
    - Connection of physical thresholds
    - Catalysing the contemplative departures beyond the physicality of the site
    - Heightening the awareness of temporal scales
### APPENDIX E3

**Design Exploration for Site E (Threshold Point 5)**

#### SITE E (THRESHOLD POINT 5) – FROM INVENTORY TO DESIGN (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detail design to achieve intended liminal experience</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • **Ephemeral Intervention**  
  > A free-flowing, simple placement of fabric placed above the markers (of the embedded design intervention)  
  >   • Amplifying the effects of natural elements (wind - changing direction & strength, light - light intensity changes effected by mere blockage of light path (by a thin and flowing piece of fabric)  
  >   • Amplifying sound from the meeting of two elements – one natural (wind), the other natural but human-processed (fabric)  
  >   • Luminescent strips, acing as liminal element, pasted onto surfaces of the marker and the platform  
  >     • Brining elements that are present during the day (light) into the night, a sense of “bending time”  
  >     • The presence of light (from the day) highlights the absence (of light at night), as a way of contemplating the ‘presence of the absence’ |
| • **Embedded Intervention**  
  > Sense of Perception, Journeying, Embodiment, Authentic Wholeness, Descriptive Hermeneutics and Projection |
| • **Ephemeral Intervention**  
  > Sense of Perception, Embodiment, Authentic Wholeness and Projection |
APPENDIX F1 (See Pages 116 & 117)

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Visual Experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO</th>
<th>SKETCH &amp; DIAGRAM</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>COLLECT</th>
<th>RESEARCH RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTRIBUTE** | VISUAL EXPERIENCE
---|---
**EMPHASIS** | ONE-POINT PERSPECTIVAL POINT
---|---
**TASK**
- Focus on a particular (vantage) point and/or physical element in the landscape
- Record the visual interest within the site
- Record any significant visual interest from beyond the site (adjacent/beyond)
- Print the photographs and do trace overlays with a thick marker, highlighting distinct lines of features that exist in between zones

METHOD CARDS TO INVENTORY LIMINAL QUALITIES IN THE LANDSCAPE
## APPENDIX F2

### Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Visual Experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO</th>
<th>SKETCH &amp; DIAGRAM</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>COLLECT</th>
<th>RESEARCH RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ATTRIBUTE

**VISUAL EXPERIENCE**

### EMPHASIS

**PERIPHERAL VISION & MULTI-PERSPECTIVAL SPACE**

### TASK

- **Focus on a particular point and/or physical element in the landscape**
- **Slowly look around 360 degrees to identify for immediate relationship (adjacencies) to that one point**
- **Walk around that one point to identify any visual occlusion**
- **Identify connections that lead into, are within, and lead out from the site**
- **Print the photographs and do trace overlays with a thick marker, highlighting distinct lines of features that exist in between zones**

---

**METHOD CARDS TO INVENTORY LIMINAL QUALITIES IN THE LANDSCAPE**
APPENDIX F3

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Visual Experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO</th>
<th>SKETCH &amp; DIAGRAM</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>COLLECT</th>
<th>RESEARCH RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTRIBUTE**  
VISUAL EXPERIENCE

**EMPHASIS**  
EPHEMERALITY (EFFECTS AND TIMEFRAME)

**TASK**
- Record (video & sound) temporal contrasts (within the site, experienced within the site but originating from adjacent sites, and within the site but causing effects on adjacent sites), like:-
  - Seasonal and daily changes
  - Passing natural elements (Rain, Snow, Wind, Heat from Sun, Light & Shadow)
- Print the photographs and do trace overlays with a thick marker, highlighting distinct lines of features that exist in between zones

METHOD CARDS TO INVENTORY LIMINAL QUALITIES IN THE LANDSCAPE
APPENDIX F4 (See Pages 118 & 119)

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Non-visual Experience)

**ATTRIBUTE** | NON-VISUAL EXPERIENCE
---|---
**EMPHASIS** | HEARING

**TASK**
- Stand with eyes closed and in silence for at least 1 minute
- Identify & record sounds and noises, taking particular attention to:-
  - Source (Distance – near/far and foreground/background)
  - Impact onto the site
  - Impact on adjacent sites, if the source is from within the site
  - Intensity & Duration
APPENDIX F5

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Non-visual Experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO</th>
<th>SKETCH &amp; DIAGRAM</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>COLLECT</th>
<th>RESEARCH RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ATTRIBUTE | NON-VISUAL EXPERIENCE

EMPHASIS | HAPTICITY (TOUCH)

TASK

- Stop, look, feel & record particular elements in the landscape:
  - Texture (Smoothness/roughness)
  - Strength (Softness/hardness)
  - Size & scale
  - Condition (Fresh & dried)

- Repeat the above-listed process, this time focusing on the relative juxtapositions of the elements onto each other, in particular at the edges of distinct demarcations.
APPENDIX F6

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Non-visual Experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>NON-VISUAL EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>FEEL (ON SKIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stand with eyes closed and in silence for at least 1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify &amp; record the experiencing of air and wind, taking particular attention to:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Sense of exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Sense of enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Intensity (Speed &amp; duration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Intensity (Temperature of surrounding spaces and elements)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHOTO

SKETCH & DIAGRAM

EXPLORE

COLLECT

RESEARCH RECORDS

METHOD CARDS TO INVENTORY LIMINAL QUALITIES IN THE LANDSCAPE
## APPENDIX F7

### Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Non-visual Experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO</th>
<th>SKETCH &amp; DIAGRAM</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>COLLECT</th>
<th>RESEARCH RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTRIBUTE**: NON-VISUAL EXPERIENCE

**EMPHASIS**: SMELL

**TASK**

- Stand with eyes closed and in silence for at least 1 minute
- Identify & record smell and scents, taking particular attention to:
  - Source (Distance – near/far and foreground/background)
  - Impact onto the site
  - Impact on adjacent sites, if the source is from within the site
  - Intensity & duration
APPENDIX F8 (See Pages 120 & 121)

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Sense of Movement)

ATTRIBUTE: SENSE OF MOVEMENT

EMPHASIS: KINAESTHETIC

TASK:
- Explore by walking (in, over, under and around) the site and record the way the body is constantly adjusted to:
  - Negotiate the terrain
  - Maneuvre around the spatial encroachment of vegetation
  - Discover special features within the landscape
- In particular, be aware of the positioning, repositioning & moving of the parts of the body activated by the physical changes at the edges of distinct demarcations
APPENDIX F9

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Sense of Movement)

**ATTRIBUTE**: SENSE OF MOVEMENT

**EMPHASIS**: SPEED

**TASK**

- Notice changes in the way the site is experienced due to changes in pace like:
  - Normal pace - Walking
  - Faster pace - Running/biking/in fast-moving vehicles
- In particular, take note of the way one zone merges with another when experienced at a speed and at a distance.
APPENDIX F10 (See Pages 122 & 123)

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Physical Characteristics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO</th>
<th>SKETCH &amp; DIAGRAM</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>COLLECT</th>
<th>RESEARCH RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ATTRIBUTE**: PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

**EMPHASIS**: FORM

**TASK**
- Measure (by rough gauge) particular physical elements and/or feature in the landscape, and record the:-
  - **Shape**
    - Individually and relative to one another, especially at points of overlaps
  - **Size**
    - Individually and relative to one another, especially at points of overlaps

- Identify thresholds of zones & look for:-
  - Distinct changes in ecosystem
  - Variations in vegetation at edges of distinct demarcations
APPENDIX F11

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Physical Characteristics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPHASIS</td>
<td>MAKE-UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stop, look, feel &amp; record landscape elements, focusing on:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Texture (Smoothness/roughness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Strength (Softness/hardness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Size &amp; scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Condition (Fresh &amp; dried)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repeat the above-listed process, this time focusing on man-made elements/objects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

METHOD CARDS TO INVENTORY LIMINAL QUALITIES IN THE LANDSCAPE
### APPENDIX F12

**Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Physical Characteristics)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Physical Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>State/Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>- Take note of:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Action of natural forces &amp; climate onto the landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ecological impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ecological diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Repeat the above-listed process, taking note of how different time scales have affected the conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

METHOD CARDS TO INVENTORY LIMINAL QUALITIES IN THE LANDSCAPE
APPENDIX F13 (See Pages 124 & 125)

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Narratives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO</th>
<th>SKETCH &amp; DIAGRAM</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>COLLECT</th>
<th>RESEARCH RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTRIBUTE** | NARRATIVES

**EMPHASIS** | HISTORICAL

**TASK**
- At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that are linked to historical significance to different groups of people
- Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated

(Image: http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/media/photo/witch-hill-memorial)
## APPENDIX F14

### Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Narratives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO</th>
<th>SKETCH &amp; DIAGRAM</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>COLLECT</th>
<th>RESEARCH RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATTRIBUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NARRATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### EMPHASIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERPRETATION &amp; STORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TASK

- At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that are linked to historical significance to different groups of people.
- Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated.

[Image](http://www.stuff.co.nz/the-express/news/9713556/Christchurch-perimeter-walks-no-signs)

[Image](http://cnc.govt.nz/chyleisure/parksandgarden/popup/appartds/theport Hills/index.aspx)
# APPENDIX F15
(See Pages 126 & 127)

**Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Metaphysical Affordance)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Metaphysical Affordance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Sense of Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that create a sense of place and/or highlight the genius loci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on how these are of significance to different groups of people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Method Cards to Inventory Liminal Qualities in the Landscape**
APPENDIX F16

Toolkit – Method Cards (Attribute – Metaphysical Affordance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO</th>
<th>SKETCH &amp; DIAGRAM</th>
<th>EXPLORE</th>
<th>COLLECT</th>
<th>RESEARCH RECORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ATTRIBUTE** METAPHYSICAL AFFORDANCE

**EMPHASIS** SYMBOLISM

**TASK**

- At the site, seek out vegetation, and physical markers or elements that are of symbolic significance and meaning
- Off-site, do a research on records that document the same linkages, paying attention to the effects that timeframes play on how zones get redefined and re-demarcated
- Focus on how these are of significance to different groups of people, in particular, how these visual & mental perceptions create a link to thoughts beyond the site’s physicality
- Pay attention to how language is used to describe and relay these interpretations

(Image: http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/media/photo/witch-hill-memorial)