Graduation Plan

Master of Science Architecture, Urbanism & Building Sciences

Graduation Plan: All tracks

Submit your Graduation Plan to the Board of Examiners (Examencommissie-BK@tudelft.nl), Mentors and Delegate of the Board of Examiners one week before P2 at the latest.

The graduation plan consists of at least the following data/segments:

Personal information	
Name	Anan Tian
Student number	5930170

Studio	
Name / Theme	Heritage Graduation Studio : Transitional Identities
Main mentor	Chris de Vries	Architecture – Design
Second mentor	Lidwine Spoormans	Architecture – Research
Argumentation of choice of the studio	This studio allows me to explore everyday memories and spatial experience concerning both tectonics and the larger pictures of historical context. I have learned from previous academic and professional projects that spatial experience is human-centered but not limited to the authorized discourse, and I seek to develop my response to the broader context while pursuing spatial quality.

Graduation project	
Title of the graduation project	'A Nostalgic Journey': Exploring An Alternative Narrative

Goal	
Location:	Zonnehui, Amsterdam North, The Netherlands
The posed problem,	The memory into facticity and precision has denied everyone's unique subjectivity, and subsequently accelerating the eradication of individual memory. This process accelerates the loss of unique individual experience, which are essential to understanding built heritage as part of human history. Authorized approaches often impose fixed, official narratives on heritage, neglecting the diverse ways people

	interact with and assign meaning to everyday spaces. The diversity of individual narratives is situated within the diverse everyday experiences and memories of shared spaces and events. In contexts of architecture and place-making, the connection between individuals and their environment is shaped by individual routines, shared practices, and emotional ties. While institutional frameworks document heritage for preservation, they often disregard the subjective dimensions that contribute to a deeper understanding of these places. This creates a disconnection between the way heritage is officially recognized and the way it is experienced in everyday life. A lack of attention to these sites reduces their potential to serve as touchstones of identity for local communities, especially when they reflect patterns of social interaction and local knowledge.
research questions and	How The Diversity of Everyday Memories That Lies Beyond The Authorized History Can Be Reflected Through Architectural Intervention? And followed by three sub-questions: RQ1. What roles do public perceptions from the everyday play in forming the understanding of built environment? RQ2. How are built heritages intervened under public perceptions from the everyday and how have they been represented through spatial elements? RQ3. How can design be applied to capture everyday perceptions as a means for social inclusion?

design assignment in which these result.	A intervention project to the existing building: A community center that celebrates everyday historical memories.
	The potential way to address the problem lies in filling the blank of the marginalized individual experience in the place-making process and bringing these values to the present and future. By including personal narratives in heritage intervention, it is possible to rethink how everyday value of history is assigned to these spaces.

Process
Method description

The project employs a methodological framework that distinguishes between virtuality and reality to reinterpret Zonnehuis's historical and cultural significance. This framework connects the concepts of authorized history and everyday (non-authorized) history, organizing various of forms of history between institutionalized narratives and informal, lived experiences.

The real layer represents the authorized history of Zonnehuis, which is formal, documented, and often institutionalized. These narratives are typically curated by experts, such as historians or conservationists, and serve to preserve the site's significance within a broader cultural and historical framework.

In contrast, the virtual layer includes everyday history, which includes non-authorized, informal, and unstable narratives. In Simulation and Simulacra, Baudrillard (1981) describes how simulations can replace reality by creating a "hyperreality" where representations no longer correspond to an original truth. Applying this concept, the virtuality layer can be understood as an attempt to reintroduce subjectivity into the understanding of Zonnehuis.

Based on the discussion above, 3 principles are developed to classify the virtual and real layers: *a) Objectivity and Subjectivity; b) Formality and Informality; c) Visibility and Obscurity.* Each of them is respectively corresponding to different design element to environments, social interactions and knowledges. The design elements will be integrated together and are used as design tools for architectural intervention practices.

Literature and general practical references

Bai, N. (2023). Sensing the cultural significance with AI for social inclusion: A computational spatiotemporal network-based framework of heritage knowledge documentation using user-generated content [Doctoral dissertation, Delft University of Technology].

Baudrillard, J. (2019). Simulacra and simulations (1981). In Crime and Media (pp. 69-85). Routledge.

Brumann, C. (2009). Outside the glass case: The social life of urban heritage in Kyoto. American Ethnologist, 36(2), 276-299.

De Regt, A. (1995). Arbeidersgezinnen en beschavingsarbeid: Ontwikkelingen in Nederland, 1870-1940: Een historisch-sociologische studie. Boom.

Fried, M. (2000). Continuities and discontinuities of place. Journal of environmental psychology, 20(3), 193-205.

Garcia, G., Amaya, J., & Tenze, A. (2019). Cultural significance: Linking actors and methods. In Structural Analysis of Historical Constructions (pp. 2053-2061). Springer, Cham.

Giombini, L. (2020). Everyday heritage and place-making. Espes, 9(2), 50-61.

Harrison, R. (2009). Understanding the Politics of Heritage. Manchester University Press.

Jhearmaneechotechai, P. (2022). Selection criteria of ordinary urban heritages through the case of Bangrak, a multi-cultural & old commercial district of Bangkok. Nakhara: Journal of Environmental Design and Planning, 21(2), 209-209.

Kalay, Y. E. (2007). Introduction: Preserving cultural heritage through digital media. In New heritage (pp. 17-26). Routledge.

Maginn, P. J. (2007). Towards more effective community participation in urban regeneration: The potential of collaborative planning and applied ethnography. Qualitative Research, 7(1), 25-43.

Mosler, S. (2019). Everyday heritage concept as an approach to place-making process in the urban landscape. Journal of Urban Design, 24(5), 778-793. https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2019.1568187

Podder, A. K., Hakim, S. S., & Bosu, S. P. (2018). Ordinary heritage. ArchNet-IJAR: International Journal of Architectural Research, 12(2), 334.

Rodéhn, C. (2015). Democratization: The performance of academic discourse on democratizing museums. In Heritage Keywords: Rhetoric and Redescription in

Cultural Heritage (pp. 95-110). University Press of Colorado.
https://doi.org/10.5876/9781607323846-010

Rowles, G. D. (1983). Place and personal identity in old age: Observations from Appalachia. Journal of environmental psychology, 3(4), 299-313.

Savini, F., & Dembski, S. (2016). Manufacturing the creative city: Symbols and politics of Amsterdam North. Cities, 55, 139-147.

Smith, L. (2006). Uses of heritage. In Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology (pp. 10969-10974). Springer, Cham.

Stadsherstel. (2016). Buurtfeestje Zonnehuis [Photograph]. Oneindig Noord- Holland. Retrieved November 1, 2024, from https://onh.nl/verhaal/hetzonnehuisschijnt-weer

Van de Kamp, L. (2023). Churches and urban regeneration in postindustrial Amsterdam. Space and Culture, 26(2), 204-214.

Walsh, G. L. (1992). Rock art retouch: Can a claim of Aboriginal descent establish curation rights over humanity's cultural heritage. Rock Art and Ethnography, 47-59.

Wells, M. (2023). Modelling the Metropolis: The Architectural Model in Victorian London. GTA Verlag. ISBN: 978−3−85676−435−7

Reflection

1. What is the relation between your graduation (project) topic, the studio topic (if applicable), your master track (A,U,BT,LA,MBE), and your master programme (MSc AUBS)?

The master program in architecture constantly brings up the subject of "positioning": how do we position ourselves as designers? and how should architecture place itself in a broader environment? The graduation studio focuses on "Heritage", referring to historical discourses whose responsibilities in society are constantly re-interpreted over time. This project in Amsterdam North urges us to reconsider the meaning of "heritage" as a everyday discourse – and in the future – and challenges us to adopt such transformation concerning historical architectural legacy. This also raises the question of how we, as future architects, deal with the past, present, and future.

2. What is the relevance of your graduation work in the larger social, professional and scientific framework.

By working with an existing building on site, the design has the potential to be realized in real life. This research seeks to form an opinion on how we treat heritage buildings. This is especially relevant for architects nowadays because we cannot simply build new without knowing what to do with the old. We should also be aware that the current architectural proposal is not the ultimate solution, and that the design should allow for future adaptions. Just as how a community center holds various forms of histories

reflecting layers of everyday memories across time, its architecture bears traces of interpretation from different generations. I think that is the charm of this architectural intervention.