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Summary

Contemporary global challenges, such as climate change, peak oil and population growth, are daunting and may, at times, seem to be insurmountable. The difficulties of addressing these challenges have been compounded even further with the current economic recession and the resultant cutbacks in public expenditure. However, it is my belief that if we work together, in a creative capacity, we can still address these pressing issues and find solutions to such 'wicked problems'. This research is established on this premise and it offers pragmatic recommendations for how this 'working together' to create a more sustainable world can be achieved in practice within the context of Dublin.

It is now generally accepted that public participation is an integral part of the sustainable development agenda. The current Dublin City Development Plan presents how Dublin City Council, (DCC), the city's local authority, is committed to the promotion of this agenda. It is, therefore, consistent that they have proposed employing a collaborative approach to reach their long term vision for the city to be '...one of the most sustainable, dynamic and resourceful city regions in Europe.' (Dublin City Council, 2010, p. 10) Yet, DCC does not have a definitive strategy formulated for developing the city in this proposed collaborative manner. The current scope, as provided for under statute, for participating in the development of Dublin is limited. However, Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn, (DD:LL), an experimental city revitalisation initiative, which was supported by DCC, presented a potentially promising approach for collaboratively developing Dublin. This initiative brought together a diverse team, made up of volunteers and local authority staff, who used a human-centred design process to develop place-specific projects, all of which aimed to revitalise Dublin. They worked in collaboration with local residents, businesses, organisations and local authorities. From a cursory examination of their pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place, it appeared that their approach to collaborative city development had promise: it was inclusive of a diverse range of actors, it appeared to offer the potential to build long term capacity in DCC for collaborative city development and it employed various resource effective strategies – a sustainable strategy in itself. There was no academic researcher examining it as a potential strategy for collaboratively developing the city. Therefore, I decided to carry out an in-depth case study of DD:LL's next major city revitalisation project, Love the City. Through being involved with them I was able to actively develop my thoughts and understanding of how Dublin can be collaboratively developed in practice.

The overall aim of this research was to develop an intimate understanding of the DD:LL. This case study was investigated, using a hybrid method of participant observation, through full and complete involvement as one of twelve members of the design team, and through carrying out design research with them. The purpose of the case study was to academically document this type of initiative and to study first-hand the approach, with a view to assessing its scalability to the entire city. Firstly, this thesis presents an overview of the landscape of design theory and practice in which DD:LL can be situated, thus contextualising their approach. Explicit influences are noted and resonant design practices and literature
are identified. Then, a ‘thick description’ of *Love the City* is given. A visualisation of how the project evolved is also produced as a way of encapsulating the complexity of the project. The description and visualisation are based on my having become a fully embedded member of the *Love the City* design team and having carried out six months of participant observation/design research with them. The legacies of DD:LL are uncovered through a series of follow-up interviews and through having carried out 2 years of industry ethnography post completion of *Love the City*. It was found that the DD:LL imparted three strands of legacies: initiatives which DD:LL spawned, legacies of DD:LL in the city and legacies of DD:LL in the working culture in DCC. This study also presents a review of the various facets of DD:LL that initially appeared to be promising. I show how *Love the City* was inclusive of an even more extensive range of actors than what might have been assumed from having examined their pilot project. However, the interaction with many of those actors was found to be lacking in some depth. The different ways in which DD:LL aimed to make effective use of resources are considered. It was found that some of these tactics worked while others did not always lead to the best outcomes. It is also shown how the initiative fed into DCC’s capacity for collaborative city development. I illustrate how these legacies impacted DCC, specifically in relation to their capacity for collaborative city development. A key finding is that the DD:LL strategy is not scalable. Unexpectedly, this is because it relied too heavily on the goodwill of volunteers. Despite some problematic issues, it has to be said that DD:LL offers a very significant experiment in an emergent arena of design. The project was timely and can provide guidance for future, similar city design laboratories. A set of recommendations are offered for these future initiatives, that draw on the strengths of DD:LL and my learning from the experience.
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Figure 1 - Howard Rourke, as played by Gary Cooper in the film *The Fountainhead*, looks out onto one of his creations (Vidor, 1949).
"I don't intend to build in order to serve or help anyone.
I don't intend to build in order to have clients.
I intend to have clients in order to build."

- Howard Roark, the architect and main protagonist in *The Fountainhead* (Rand, 1943/1994)

The journey towards embarking on this PhD has been a circuitous one. The thoughts contained herein began to germinate in 2004 when, having graduated from a degree in architecture, I began work in an award-winning architectural practice in Dublin, Ireland. One of my first assignments was to make a large model of a proposed ‘master-plan’ for the redevelopment of an inner city social housing complex. The project was located in an area of the city that was designated to be in need of ‘regeneration’. The client, the local authority, had given the architecture practice a brief for the project, which detailed requirements such as the number and type of residential units, the amount of communal and private outdoor space and the number of car parking spaces. After some consideration of the physical context and based on this outline brief, the principle architect made an initial sketch of a proposed scheme on some tracing paper. He then handed this sketch to the senior designer to interpret and work up into a more developed proposal. It appeared to consist of eight blocks of apartments, of differing heights, which were either arranged around a courtyard or around a public thoroughfare. The senior designer developed the sketch to reflect this interpretation, cleverly ‘borrowing elements’ from previous work that the practice had completed and referencing the designs of the principal architect’s hero, a world renowned Portuguese architect. I was instructed to make a model of the proposed scheme in white Styrofoam, based on this developed sketch. This model would be used to illustrate and explain the proposed design to the future residents at the upcoming public consultation meeting. This would be the first time that we would interact with them.

Just before this meeting, I proudly carried the completed pristine white model into senior designer’s office and presented it to her. When she laid eyes on it she shrieked ‘Oh no, it’s much too big, it will never fit one of the Perspex cases.’ I hadn’t known that the standard model-making procedure was to make them fit into the one of the transparent boxes, which were stacked up neatly in a corner of the office. So a little embarrassed and a little confused, I asked ‘Why does it need to be in a plastic box?’ ‘We don’t want them getting it dirty with their grubby little hands,’ she replied. The people that she was referring to were the attendees of the upcoming ‘public consultation’ meeting, the future residents and users of the proposed scheme.

This anecdote is relayed in order to highlight some shortcomings, which I have experienced, in how the architecture profession, in cooperation with the local authority, have approach public participation in urban regeneration projects in the past. Firstly, the future residents were completely remote from the
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design process. Their needs, wants and desires were presented as a schedule of requirements in square metres. The client, the local authority, made no attempt to convey to the architecture practice the particularities of culture and place that were important to the future residents. Nor was any attempt made to describe their existing lifestyle, what they enjoyed about their current lifestyle and how they would like it to be improved through the 'regeneration' process. Furthermore, no opportunity was afforded to introduce the architecture firm to the future residents. That said, the architects themselves made little effort to familiarise themselves with the needs, desires and knowledge of the future residents. One might imagine that such insights would have helped spark the imagination of the architect, enrich the design process and ensure relevance of the outcome. Instead, the proposal took inspiration from a combination of projects which the office had previously completed, the work of a Portuguese architect and abstracted ideas about form. I am not arguing that there is anything wrong with self-referencing or finding inspiration in unlikely sources. Designers do this all the time and it is an accepted way of helping to advance the design process. However, I think this should be done in conjunction with careful consideration of the user. A further shortcoming of this approach to public participation is that the consultation, in the manner in which it was conducted, was neither deep nor extensive. The consultation meeting merely served as a vehicle for the future residents to either approve or disapprove of the already developed concept. There was no opportunity for them to contribute in a generative manner, to add to the design process in an imaginative capacity or to design together/with the architect. The transparent case, in which the white model was housed, acted as a metaphor, illustrating the users' detached position in the design process. They were permitted to look and comment, but restricted from getting involved in a meaningful way.

Although not all architectural practitioners act in such an elitist manner, I have encountered such attitudes on many occasions throughout my five years in professional practice. It is a lingering legacy of the modernist tradition, where the architect, as the expert and genius, conceives of the perfect project and imposes their vision onto the landscape in a grand sweeping gesture. This caricature of the architect is most famously presented in the character of Howard Rourke from The Fountainhead by Ayn Rand (1943/1994, Vidor, 1949). Just like many other modernist architects, he designed housing schemes consisting of stark tower blocks standing on green, 'free flowing' public space. Such projects aimed to allow access for all to light, air and space, purporting to offer a healthier alternative to the overcrowded, squalid tenements of the historical inner city. However, in practice, this approach has, quite notoriously, avoided giving consideration to the human dimension. Rather, the automobile took priority. The resultant public spaces were designed without the human-scale in mind and thus proved to be lifeless and bland – an ironic outcome considering that the ethos of modernism was to improve the living conditions of all inhabitants. Such projects, which failed to live up to their promises, instigated a host of modernist critiques, most notably The Life and Death of Great American Cities by Jane Jacobs.
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(1962). This was written in reaction to a proposal by Robert Moses\(^1\) to level part of a historic neighbourhood in New York in order to make way for an expressway, which would cut through the city. Through a process of direct observation, Jacobs illustrates what makes a city thrive: pedestrian use of the street, dense neighbourhoods that encourage human contact and multiple small local businesses. She brings into focus how modernist planning projects ignore implementing the very qualities of the built environment that encourage activity on the street. Without such activity, the built environment fails to benefit from the associated advantages of a greater sense of safety in the city and a thriving local economy. Such critiques have spurred the development of new modes of city development practices that encourage greater public participation and a greater recognition of and attention to the local physical, social and cultural context. Although some architectural practitioners have embraced such participatory and contextually sensitive approaches, this attitude towards the user still dominates in the architecture profession. Till (2009) has written extensively about how the architect acts as the detached expert who is disengaged from the messy world in which her design will be situated. He describes how architecture, as a profession, has turned in on itself and has made every effort to remain autonomous. He claims that, typically, architects are mostly interested in perfecting the self-derived, abstracted and conceptually ‘pure’ project. In working in this way, they have avoided dealing with what he terms ‘the contingencies’ of the real world, including users, time and decay. Such things, he claims, might only threaten the purity of the concept. Till further argues that order and certainty are restrictive in the design process. He urges the architect to embrace these messy ‘contingencies’ and to view them opportunistically, as they can help to open up possibilities and enrich both the design process and the end product.

Such personal experiences and critiques provided this research with a point of departure from which to evolve. The goal, at the outset, was to explore what a more participatory, a more user-centred and a more contextually urban regeneration approach would mean in the context of my beloved home city – Dublin. With this goal in mind, I was very fortunate to have been afforded the opportunity to examine Designing Dublin – Learning to Learn (DD:LL), a highly experimental city revitalisation initiative. Through being involved with them I was able to actively develop my thoughts and understanding of how Dublin can be collaboratively developed in practice.

\(^1\) Robert Moses was a very influential developer in New York in the mid-20th century. He favoured highways over public transport and helped create much of the private vehicular infrastructure in the city. He also helped create the modern suburb of Long Island.
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Figure 2 – The advertisement seeking volunteers to join Love the City.
1 INTRODUCTION

'One obstacle to an accurate, working definition of sustainability may well be the historical perspective that sees that practice as pre-existing, either in our past or as a Platonic concept. I believe instead that our sustainable future does not yet exist, in reality or even in strategy. We do not yet know what it will look like; it is being socially constructed through a sustained period of conflict negotiation and resolution. This is a process of innovation, not of discovery and converting the nonbelievers.'

- Scott Campbell (1996, p. 302)

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the academic context in which the research was carried out and describes how this project evolved since its inception in 2009. Firstly, some contextualising information about the city in question, Dublin, is given. Then, the thorny issue of sustainable urban development is unravelled and the link between sustainable development and participation is established, as a way of laying the conceptual building blocks to support this thesis. Following on from this, the challenges associated with public participation are explored and the distinction between the idea of participation and collaboration is examined. Then, the long term vision for Dublin, as laid out in the city development plan is described. The collaborative approach that Dublin City Council (DCC) have proposed as a way of reaching this vision is also noted. Then, the current scope for participating in the development of Dublin, as provided for under statute, is described. It is concluded that there are limited opportunities to do so, in a meaningful manner. However, Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn (DD:LL), an experimental city revitalisation initiative, which was supported by DCC, presented a potentially promising approach for developing Dublin in a collaborative manner. Therefore, a brief description of their general approach is given. Their pilot project, which tested this approach and led me to this conclusion, is also illustrated. This chapter finishes with presenting the overall research aims and objectives and a brief outline of how the remainder of this thesis will unfold.

1.2 THE ACADEMIC CONTEXT

In 2009, I joined a multidisciplinary research group at TrinityHaus, Trinity College Dublin, whose broad remit was to tackle the thorny issue of sustainable urban development, using the existing city, Dublin, as a ‘living laboratory’ in which to ground the studies. The group consisted of postgraduates from architecture, engineering, geography and computer science. Over the course of the following four years, each researcher developed a specific area of this overall broad brief and strengthening each other’s research through ongoing dialogue in the research centre.
1.3 THE GEOGRAPHICAL CONTEXT

Dublin, the city which anchors all of these research projects, is the capital city of Ireland, a sovereign state located on the island of Ireland, on the edge of Western Europe. It is situated on the halfway mark on the east coast of the island, at the mouth of the River Liffey. Currently, the city region has a population of 1,270,603 and spans 921 km². The Dublin Regional Authority directs the overall development of the region, which is made up of four local authorities including DCC, Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council, Fingal County Council and South Dublin County Council. The focus of this PhD is on the city centre and the administrative area of DCC, which has a population of 525,383 (CSO, 2011).

Contemporary Dublin has seen dramatic changes over the past 20 years. From 1995-2007, Ireland experienced an unparalleled economic boom, commonly referred to as the 'Celtic Tiger'. In this time the city's physical, social and economic landscape changed immensely. There was enormous private and public sector development of housing and infrastructure. The economy was heavily reliant on the performance of the construction sector. In 2008, the domestic housing bubble burst and Ireland entered an economic crisis, the severity of which was exacerbated by the global financial crisis (Drudy and Collins, 2011). The physical development in the city dramatically shuddered to a halt and many building sites were abandoned mid-construction (Kitchin and Gleeson, 2012). This ghostly urban landscape and this economic crisis form the backdrop to this thesis.

The sustainable development of Dublin is a particularly pertinent topic. Despite the promotion of sustainable development having been on the global political agenda for the past 25 years, Dublin still has significant progress to make in this regard. The pursuit of sustainable urban development drives this thesis. Therefore, this contested subject matter is now briefly explored. Then the role of participation within the sustainable development agenda is examined, as it is at the nexus of these two topics that this research is located.

There has been limited comprehensive evaluation of this progress carried out to date, but the efforts that have been made will now be discussed, along with some key figures, as they help to contextualise this research. Firstly, it is important to mention that an ecological footprint of the city has never been calculated. However, Irish people, in general, have poor results in this regard. The World Wildlife Fund estimates that if everyone on the planet consumed the same resources as the average Irish person we would need the equivalent of three and a half planets to sustain the global population (WWF, 2008). Ireland faces particular challenges in relation to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions and meeting its targets under the Kyoto protocol agreement, being 90% fossil fuel dependent (SEI, 2007). Although the average Dubliner produces less CO₂ per year than the average Irish person (1.6 tonnes), the resultant figure of 9.7 tonnes of emissions of CO₂ per year, per person still needs to be drastically reduced (Dublin City Council, 2008). The European Green City Index, created by Siemens, measures and rates the performance of 30 leading European cities from 30 European countries, taking into account 30 indicators per city. The indicators cover a wide range of environmental areas, including CO₂ emissions, energy consumption, building energy efficiency, transport, water consumption, waste and land use, air quality and environmental governance. Dublin is ranked 21 out of 30 in this index and is ranked last in relation to transport (Siemens, 2009).
1.4 SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1.4.1 Sustainable development

Development has conventionally been conceived as the promotion of prosperity by way of emulating a form of modernisation based on the Western capitalistic model, where societies aim to become more technically adept, more urbanised and more democratic. It has been said that by-product of such development is that a heightened value is placed on self-advancement and self-attainment (Baker, 2006). In this conception of modernisation, economic growth takes precedence over social and environmental issues and it is assumed that overall economic growth will result in increased levels for wealth for all. However, this ‘trickle down’ of wealth has rarely resulted and the gap between the rich and the poor continues to widen. With the exclusive goal of pursuing economic growth, natural capital has been continually exploited, a problem which has been magnified by a sharp rise in population growth and increased levels of consumption of goods (Baker, 2006, Fuad-Luke, 2009, Wood, 2007a). In 1972, the Club of Rome exposed the shortcomings of this model of development, in a report entitled ‘The Limits to Growth’. They illustrated that in a world in which ecosystems are finite, there are limits to endless economic expansion (Meadows et al., 1972). Since the publication of this seminal report, there has been a growing recognition of the dynamic interconnectedness between economic growth, the ecosystem and social/cultural issues. Sustainable development, as a concept, challenges the traditional notion of development and offers an alternative, more holistic model of modernisation, where equal consideration is given to social, environmental and economic development. The idea of making development sustainable first came onto the global political agenda with the United Nations (UN) Conference on the Human Environment in 1972. It was the UN’s first major conference on international environmental issues and was conceived in the light of the combined pressing issues of population growth, natural resource depletion and environmental degradation. However, it was not until 1987 that the UN coined the specific term ‘sustainable development’, where it was used to describe ‘development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (WCED, 1987). The concept was further developed by the UN at subsequent conferences: the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 and the Rio+20 conference in June 2012.
In its most widespread conceptualisation, sustainable development appears straightforward; it is development that values economic, societal and environmental issues equally. This model is often illustrated with the image of the three overlapping circles, see Figure 3. However, there is little consensus regarding the precise meaning of the term ‘sustainable development’, because the concept is contested and the ideas it invokes are ambivalent and complex (Redclift, 2006, Connelly, 2007, Davison, 2008). Davidson (2008) has summed up the situation when he noted that the vagueness surrounding the concept has resulted in the accumulation of ‘an absurd number of definitions’. Redclift has pointed out that this ambiguity has stemmed from the fact that ‘needs’ are difficult to define and mutate over time (Redclift, 2006). In practice, the inherent vagueness of sustainable development has resulted in it being interpreted in various different ways, by various different actors (Hopwood et al., 2005, Connelly, 2007). Baker (2006) has illustrated that locating ones position in the sustainability debate depends on whether ones bias is more ‘anthropocentric’ or ‘ecocentric’ with the resulting spectrum of positions ranging from ‘weak sustainability’ to ‘strong sustainability’. At the weak end of the spectrum, both economic growth and environmental protection are promoted simultaneously, allowing for the substitution of natural capital with human capital. This is facilitated by assigning a monetary value to natural resources and assessing the economic benefits of using this capital. If the benefits outweigh the losses, then the natural capital is used. Weak sustainability is also characterised by top-down governance, elite participation and limited dialogue between the state and civil society. At the strong end of the spectrum, it is argued that certain aspects of natural capital cannot be assigned a monetary value because they are critical to the...
survival of the earth and they are, therefore, priceless. Participation at this end of the spectrum is more democratic and open. Hopwood et al. (2005), in interrogating how sustainable development is interpreted in practice, has added a third dimension to this 'anthropocentric'/ 'ecocentric' continuum: that of equality. This provides further nuances in interrogating how the concept is interpreted in various ways, by various parties, see Figure 4.

Figure 4 - The various interpretation of sustainable development (Hopwood et al., 2005).

Campbell (1996) has discussed at length the difficulties that exist in the planner’s pursuit of sustainable development in practice, difficulties that are usually associated with financial constraints. He has suggested that the point of overlap of the three areas of concern - environmental, economic and social - the illusive sweet spot where sustainable development is said to exist, can never be reached. The planner can only work towards it through sustained negotiation with various interested parties, aiming to balance the conflicting goals with regard to the specifics of the particular situation. Baker (2006) has also pointed out that sustainable development is not an end state; rather, it implies a process of making gradual improvements in the three interrelated areas of concern. Therefore, she talks about the idea of 'promoting' sustainable development instead of 'achieving' sustainable development. She also notes that there is no exact blueprint to describe how this promotion can be done and that all approaches ought to be tailored to their specific context.
1.4.2 Sustainable urban development

As the focus of this thesis is on the sustainable development of Dublin, the conceptual underpinnings of sustainable urban development, in particular, are now considered. This issue has become particularly pertinent, due to the fact that half of humanity now live in cities and this figure is expected to rise to 60% within the next two decades (UN-Habitat, 2008). Cities are particularly problematic for the sustainability agenda having dense populations and, therefore, high levels of consumption. They occupy only 2% of the earth's surface, but they use 75% of the earth's resources. Therefore, they are greedy and place a great burden on the local and global ecosystems (Girardet, 1999). However, cities may also offer advantages over rural habitats, with regard to the promotion of sustainable development. By virtue of the fact that they have dense populations, they can make use of the principle of economies of scale, achieving greater efficiencies in the use of services. They also offer more opportunities to mix and share resources (Baker, 2006, Wood, 2007b).

In 1998, the architect Lord Richard Rodgers, gave the following normative description of a sustainable city. This frequently cited description\(^3\) serves to bring to light the multifaceted nature of the goal of sustainable urban development and acts as what DeGeus might call 'a navigational compass' to direct its promotion (de Geus, 2002). Rodgers notes a sustainable city is:

---

\(^3\) Google Scholar reported on the 27 November 2012 that this was cited 347 times
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‘A Just City, where justice, food, shelter, health and hope are fairly distributed;
A Beautiful City, where art, architecture, and landscape spark the imagination and move the spirit;
A Creative City, where open-mindedness and experimentation mobilise the full potential of its human resources and allows the fast response to change;
An Ecological City, which minimises its ecological impact, where landscape and built form are balanced and where buildings and infrastructures are safe and resource efficient;
A City of Easy Contact and Mobility, where information is exchanged both face-to-face and electronically;
A Compact and Polycentric City, which protects the countryside, focuses and integrates communities within neighbourhoods and maximises proximity;
A Diverse City, where a broad range of overlapping activities create animation, inspiration and foster a vital public life.’ (Rogers, 1998)

In Section 1.4.1, it was established that promoting sustainable development is an involved task. A city is a highly complex organism, consisting of myriad of intricately interrelated actors and factors (Jacobs, 1961/1992). Therefore, promoting sustainable development within an urban context and is a particularly complex and involved task. However, this has not deterred people in their efforts to promote sustainable urban development. There are numerous examples of how planners and urban designers have tried to create sustainable cities. Having reviewed a vast body of sustainable development and environmental planning literature, Jabareen (2006) has concluded that there are seven overriding planning concepts that have been used repeatedly. These comprise compactness, sustainable transport, density, mixed land uses, diversity, passive solar design and greening. Increasing the energy efficiency of the urban environment is the main goal of each of these strategies. However, McDonough has highlighted the limitations associated with striving to improve the built environment through creating buildings that are merely more energy efficient. Instead of striving for eco-efficiency, he urges us to strive for eco-effectiveness. He points out that the difference between eco-efficiency and eco-effectiveness is similar to ‘the difference between an airless, fluorescent-lit gray cubicle and a sunlit area full of fresh air, natural views, and pleasant places to work, eat and converse.’ (McDonough and Braungart, 2009, p. 74) There is more to creating a sustainable city than increasing its energy efficient.

Girardet, a leading figure in the realm of urban sustainable development, advances the idea of optimising a city’s metabolism, suggesting that the sustainable city ought to operate in a symbiotic and cyclical manner, whereby outputs can also be inputs in the production system and whereby relationships are organised so as to maximise mutual benefits (Girardet, 1993, Girardet, 2008). Wood has also proposed a similar, yet more all encompassing, idea of a city that strives to operate in holistic terms, maximising mutual benefits for all its inhabitants. He suggests that in such a synergistic city there are ‘no business reasons why laundries, bakeries and restaurants should not ‘mix and share’ their food cultivation, building, heating systems, brand-identity, hospitality policies and customer relations’ (Wood, 2007b, p. 82). Girardet also notes that a further attribute of a sustainable city is that it is convivial, meaning that it is a place where people want to work, live and play. He suggests that such an environment should offer a
Richness of urban experience, daily inspiration and an interesting and lively public life (Girardet, 1993, Girardet, 1999, Girardet, 2008). Ultimately, he asserts that there must be wholeness in creating sustainable cities and the aspects that must be considered are economics, infrastructure, architecture, social networks, cultural realities and the environmental base. Considering the multifaceted nature of the issue, he suggests that it ought to be tackled from various angles simultaneously. Therefore, he suggests that endeavours to create sustainable cities should leverage the knowledge of the city's citizens in combination with strengthening local democratic processes (Girardet, 1999). The role that citizen participation plays in the promotion of sustainable development is discussed in more detail in the following section.

1.4.3 Participation and sustainable development

At the 1992 UN Earth Summit in Rio, citizen participation was first highlighted as being a key aspect of the sustainable development agenda. This was explicitly noted in Agenda 21, the non-binding and voluntarily implemented action plan for the promotion of sustainable development, which was issued on the back of this Summit and which Ireland signed up to. It is now generally agreed that enhancing citizen participation and involvement in governance is a key factor in promoting sustainable development (UNCED, 1993, OECD, 2001, Meadowcroft, 2004, Meldon et al., 2004). This view was reiterated in the 2013 government publication on sustainable development: Our Sustainable Future – a Framework for Sustainable Development in Ireland. It notes:

'It is widely accepted that economic growth, social cohesion and environmental protection go hand in hand to meet the overarching goal of delivering wellbeing in a pluralistic society that promotes participation, a society in which everyone takes responsibility for the environment.' (GOI, 2012:13)

Meadowcroft and Baker have discussed the rationale for encouraging participation in the promotion of sustainable development, Baker noting that these reasons fall into two categories: normative and functional. The first normative reason is that participation in decisions, which affect one's life, is a hallmark of a democratic society. Therefore, extending democratization is itself an end goal of sustainable development. The second normative reason is that participation is implicit in the concept of sustainable development, because it involves guiding social change. The third normative reason is that developing solutions to promote sustainable development is a value laden activity, with personal preferences being dependant on one's position on the spectrum of sustainability, i.e. from weak to strong. Therefore, deliberation over decisions ought to be facilitated in order to penetrate the thorny issue of what constitutes development in the interest of the common good and to transcend vested interests. The first functional reason for promoting participation in sustainable development is so as to enhance the legitimacy of decisions. In this sense, participation is seen to contribute to more effective implementation. The second functional reason is that participation can be a mechanism of reaching better decisions, through the incorporation of differing views and local knowledge (Baker, 2006, 29
Russel (2010) has echoed this view and has noted that the solution space for the promotion of sustainable development should be opened up to the transdisciplinary imagination, because it is a wicked problem. A final functional reason, for promoting participation in sustainable development, is that a potential by-product of this action is that the public are better informed, if such participation allows for substantive deliberation.

1.4.4 Quality of participation

DEMOS, the UK based, cross-party think-tank that focuses on researching power and politics, have described how democratisation can be extended. They reference political theorist, John Dryzek's framework for considering the three necessary dimensions of extension (Cornwall, 2008). The first of these dimensions is referred to as 'franchise' and this concerns the number of people who have the capability to participate in a substantive manner. The second of these dimensions is referred to as 'scope' and this concerns the type and level of importance of issues that people have the opportunity to be involved in. The third of these dimensions is referred to as the 'authenticity of the control' and this concerns the level to which power is redistributed to people. As early as 1969, Arnstein had noted a similar concern about the authenticity of participatory processes. He developed a conceptual framework, entitled 'The Ladder of Citizen Participation', which describes eight different types of participation and ranks them according to the degree to which they reallocate power to people. This framework is reproduced in Figure 6 (Arnstein, 1969).

---

4 Transdisciplinarity exceeds multisidiciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches because the former evokes the idea that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Transdisciplinarity includes all forms of knowledge that are relevant to an issue and this knowledge can extend beyond the academic disciplines (Ramadier, 2004, Lawrence, 2010). The rationale for taking a transdisciplinary approach is that choices are well-considered from a variety of perspectives, rather than relying on the limited scope of vision of a particular discipline. The outcome of a transdisciplinary design process would be an amalgamation of different disciplinary perspective, which is not directly attributable to any one discipline (Dykes et al., 2009).

5 The term 'wicked problem' was coined in 1973 by Rittel and Weber. They asserted that problems such as solving complex social-environmental planning issues are 'wicked problems' and they contrast these with 'tame problems', which scientists and some classes of engineers deal with. The scientist's problems can be solved using existing modes of inquiry, in controlled environments and can be definitively formulated. In contrast, wicked problems are said to defy definitive formulation and solutions to such problems cannot be tested. Therefore, there is no opportunity to learn by trial and error. All wicked problems are unique and interconnected with other problems. There are many ways to describe and represent a wicked problem and how the problem is framed will determine how it is addressed (Rittel and Webber, 1973).
The mismatch between the normative ideals of participation and the realities of implementing measures to achieve those ideals is a recurring theme in the literature (Flyvbjerg, 1998, Richardson and Connelly, 2005). With participatory governance, the ideal situation is that consensus is reached through rational argument, which is fully inclusive of all stakeholders and of all issues. In theory it is a non-confrontational process. However, it is noted that there are three pragmatic issues with the implementation of this ideal. These comprise:

- It is not possible to include all stakeholders all the time and, therefore, a sample of stakeholders must be chosen and some other stakeholders excluded.
- It is not possible to address all possible issues all the time, therefore choices must be made about which issues to address.
- It is not possible to address all possible outcomes in a meaningful and deep way; where efforts are made to reach a consensus about policies, which are inclusive of multiple outcomes, the process often results in creating bland, broad goals that can be easily agreed upon by all stakeholders.
It has also been noted that participatory processes tend to fall short of their ideals because they do not take into account that people do not always act in a purely rational ways. For instance, there is a risk that people partaking in participatory process might only do so in order to promote their own personal agenda rather than the collective good and, if these people are powerful enough, they might skew the outcome. With these thoughts in mind, Richardson and Connelly suggest that if 'we cannot remove power, the alternative is to include power as inescapable and all pervasive, essential and productive, rather than as negative and oppressive' (Richardson and Connelly, 2005, p. 80). Given that there is no ideal process of participatory governance, they argue that we should understand their efforts in relation to achieving pragmatic consensus.

There are various other challenges associated with implementing participatory processes, an awareness of which is critical for this research (Innes and Booher, 2004, Irvin and Stansbury, 2004, Callanan, 2005, Baker, 2006, Kaza, 2006, McInerney and Adshead, 2010). Such challenges and issues include:

- The risk that participatory processes are more accessible to the well-educated and well-mobilised.
- The risk of undermining the already established representative democratic system.
- The risk of ceding control to people who may not be well informed about the particular issue in question.
- The risk of the participatory process itself engendering new elites.
- Where participation is limited to voting, the risk that there is no scope for radical solutions, noting that the outcome will be a 'mean' solution whose intention is to satisfy all parties.
- Given that participatory processes can be time consuming, the risk that they are only accessible to people who have time to spare.
- The high cost of implementing participatory governance processes.

### 1.4.5 Collaboration versus participation

This thesis investigates how to develop Dublin in a collaborative manner and not in a participatory manner. Therefore, the differences between the two approaches are now described. Innes and Booher, reviewed the literature on public participation in the fields of politics, planning and public administration and examined various contemporary practices within these fields. They conclude that collaborative approaches are more preferable to participatory approaches. They note that participatory approaches are often one-way, whereby citizens are invited by a governmental authority to give input only. They note that viewing participation in this dualistic way has resulted in the relationship evolving in an adversarial manner and that this is at odds with the pluralistic world, which consists of many stakeholders and actors: profit-making organisations, non-profit organisations, various interest groups and public administrators. The challenge, they note, is to integrate all these different actors, to give them the opportunity to interact with one another, while at the same time allowing them to act
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independently. Therefore, in reaction to the participatory dualist model, Innes and Booher propose the idea of a collaborative approach, which they describe as ‘a multi-dimensional model where communication, learning and action are joined together and where the polity, interests and citizenry co-evolve’ (Innes and Booher, 2004: 422). The attributes of a collaborative approach include that it is progressed through dialogue, that it is inclusive of diverse participants, that participants are involved at the outset, that knowledge is shared and that there is continuous engagement. They also note that, due to the involved nature, participatory processes should only be used for controversial choices.

Miessen also promotes the idea of taking a collaborative approach over participatory approach and his argument helps to give further clarity to the differences between the two. After having examined the difficulties of implementing the participatory ideals in the realm of architecture, urban design, urban planning and politics, he notes that democratic notions of participatory decision making are often viewed though a romantic, rose-tinted lenses. He notes that it is assumed that a common ground can be readily established, through a process of consensus. However, he also points out that in practice, participatory processes are messy and conflict laden (Miessen, 2010). He advances the idea of taking a collaborative approach, because such an approach more closely reflects a world that is inclusive of such conflict and ambiguity. He references what Florian Schneider has to say about the ideal of collaboration; rather than romantic notions of a common ground or commonality, collaboration is driven by complex realities and is an ambivalent process, constituted by a set of paradoxical relationships between co-producers who affect each other (Schneider, 2006).

1.5 REACHING DUBLIN’S ‘OFFICIAL FUTURE’ USING A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH

The current Dublin City Development Plan, guides how and where development will be undertaken in the city until 2017. The overall objective of the plan is to articulate a spatial framework for the delivery of sustainable development of the city as a way of working towards an ‘improved quality of life for its citizens’ (Dublin City Council, 2010, p. 6). It sets out policies and objectives which are aligned to the long term vision for the city, which it describes as follows:

‘Within the next 25 to 30 years, Dublin will have an established international reputation as one of the most sustainable, dynamic and resourceful city regions in Europe. Dublin, through the shared vision of its citizens and civic leaders, will be a beautiful, compact city, with a distinct character, a vibrant culture and a diverse, smart, green, innovation-based economy. It will be a socially inclusive city of urban neighbourhoods, all connected by an exemplary public transport, cycling and walking system and interwoven with a quality bio-diverse greenspace network. In short, the vision is for a capital city where people will seek to live, work and experience as matter of choice.’ (Dublin City Council, 2010, p. 10)

The plan has stipulated that they are going to employ a ‘collaborative approach’ as a way of reaching this vision for the city.
The successful implementation of a significant number of the policies and objectives of the plan will necessitate **ongoing collaboration** and a sense of good-will across a range of agencies and stakeholders. Dublin City Council will actively undertake a leadership role to progress and secure the implementation of the plan. In providing this leadership role, the City Council will foster a **collaborative approach** with the citizens, stakeholders, sectoral interests, city partners and adjoining authorities to achieve collective support and successful implementation of the plan.’ (Dublin City Council, 2010, p. 178)

Yet, the specific mechanisms that will be used to achieve this ‘collaborative approach’ are not mentioned or alluded to by DCC. The development plan merely notes they will use new communication tools, ‘such as the internet’, to help develop dialogue and debate, create networks and to get ‘feedback’ about the implementation of the plan. That said, there is a limited and restricted number of existing mechanisms, as provided for under statute, which allow people to contribute to the development of Dublin. These are discussed in the following section.

It should also be noted that Dublin City Planner, Dick Gleeson, has often promoted the idea of ‘collaborative urbanism’. As part of this research, an interview was undertaken with him where he elaborated on what he meant by this term:

‘.....my ideal way of looking at this [collaborative urbanism] for the future, would be where you are able to invite the citizen to co-create the city of the future. That is essentially what it means, it means something far beyond consultation, it’s not passive, it’s actually dynamic. It’s open, it’s energetic, it’s respectful and it’s essentially optimistic and hopeful. That you can actually think of a framework that would allow you to draw in the capacity of citizens and groups, to share in the management of the city and in dealing with issues and grabbing opportunities as they come along. And it’s at all scales and it’s in all sectors.’ (Gleeson, 2013)

### 1.6 THE SCOPE FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF DUBLIN

The current, limited scope for participating in the development of Dublin, as provided for under statute, is now reviewed. Excluding the general election, the first way in which citizens can influence the development of the city is by voting in the five-yearly local elections, whereby a system of proportional representation is used to elect the members of the local authorities. Each local authority is sub-divided into a number of local areas from which candidates are chosen. The functions of the local authority are divided into reserve and executive functions. Reserve functions are carried out by the representatives elected in the local elections and consist of all matters pertaining to policy and principle, including the making of the development plan. Everything that is not a reserve function is an executive function and is carried out by local authority staff (Meldon et al., 2004, Keane, 2003). The voter turnout in the local elections in 2009 was just under 58% nationally (Quinlivan and Weeks, 2010).
Meldon has noted that outside the democratic process, the planning process is a key area in which citizens can participate directly in local government (Meldon et al., 2004). DCC, as the local authority for Dublin's city centre, provides the city with the majority of public services, including the planning services. Under the Planning and Development Acts 2000-2010 public participation in local development is facilitated through the process of making the development plan for that area. The current Dublin City Development plan covers the years 2011-2017 and was conceived within the context of the agenda of the National Development Plan, National Spatial Strategy, National Climate Change Strategy, Smarter Travel – A Sustainable Transport Future, Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area and Transport 21 (Dublin City Council, 2010).

The public consultation process in relation to the making of the development plan happens broadly in the following way. Every six years the local authority makes a new development plan. At the start of this process, they seek submissions from the public. They are bound to take these submissions into consideration when making the draft plan. This draft plan will then go on public display and further submissions are requested. The city/county manager will then prepare a report for the elected members based on all submissions received. The elected members will either accept or reject the draft development plan. If it is amended, a further public consultation process will ensue and further submissions will be invited. If, however, the elected members do not adopt the plan within two years of the start of the process the city manager is empowered to devise the development plan (Keane, 2003).

The current Dublin City Development Plan used some additional and non-statutory measures to encourage the public to participate in its development. Along with the traditional model of displaying the draft plan in public libraries, supplying a soft copy on-line and hard copies on request, DCC also built a website to communicate the intentions the proposed plan. The public could then use this website to make submissions and have discussions about it. Also, a physical exhibition entitled 'My City' was made in the DCC central office, which also described the intentions of the development plan. Submission could also be made here, via a video recording. With regard to the most recent development plan, 695 initial formal submissions were made by the general public. This is the only instance, as provided for under statute, where Dubliners can participate in city development in a generative capacity. Yet, only a very small proportion of the population choose do so. In reaction to the draft development plan, a further 513 formal submissions were made before the current development plan was finalised (Dublin City Council, 2010).

Also, under the Planning and Development Acts (2000-2010), the local authority 'may' make local area plans and these 'must' be taken into consideration when planning applications are being assessed. Local area plans take a detailed look at a specific area, establish issues of relevance for that area and set out principles for development there. Public consultation is carried out in the creation of these plans, but no exact guidelines are given describing how this public consultation will happen. In a similar way to the
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making of the development plan, a draft local area plan is put on public display. The public can make a submission or observation based on this plan and this will be taken into account in the making of the final local area plan. Also facilitated under this act, citizen’s can participate in local development by objecting to planning applications, Special Amenity Area Orders and Landscape Conservation Area Orders. Again, the role of the citizen is not substantive and she is limited to being involved in a reactionary capacity.

1.6.1 Enhancing participatory democracy in Ireland

The Local Government Act (2001) aimed to enhance participatory democracy in Ireland at a local level, to serve ‘the customer’ better and to develop efficiencies by enhancing the role of the elected members and by introducing a range of reforms such as strategic policy committees, county development boards and city development boards (Forde, 2005). The Dublin City Development Board, in aiming to increase the quality and quantity of inter-agency work, brings together representatives from local government, various statutory agencies, local development groups and social partners to draw up a strategy for the economic, social and cultural development of the city and the community (DCC, 2011). Community and voluntary groups are represented on the Dublin City Development Board via Dublin City Community Forum. The forum is administered by DCC and consists of over 700+ groups and provides a platform for discussing the development, planning and management of Dublin. The Dublin City Development Board has 27 representatives in total; however, only three of these are from the community development forum. There are six strategic policy committees in DCC and they aim to formulate, develop, monitor and review policies relating to specific functions of DCC. Each strategic policy committee consists of ten councillors and five people from various other organisations, including community and voluntary groups. The voluntary and community sector representatives are in the minority. These reform measures have been criticised as a result (Forde, 2005). Strategic policy committees have also been criticised because they can only make policy recommendations and the final decision, regarding implementation of these recommendations, rests with the council. It has also been noted that some of the community and voluntary sector representatives have found strategic policy committee meetings to be ‘intimidating, bureaucratic, mechanistic and a destructive experience’ (Forde, 2005). Therefore, it can be concluded that the mechanisms, which were facilitated under the Local Government Act and which aimed to enhance participatory democracy in Ireland at a local level, are limited in their capacity to advance substantive participation in the development of Dublin.

1.7 DD:LL - AN EXAMPLE OF HOW DUBLIN CAN BE COLLABORATIVELY DEVELOPED

It has been established that there are currently limited opportunities, as provided for under statute, for citizens to participate in the development of Dublin, despite the fact that the city development plan promotes the idea of adopting a ‘public engagement and a partnership approach’ as a way of working towards the long term vision to be a sustainable city. However, there are some experimental projects.
Collaboratively Designing Dublin that DCC support through the conduit of the Creative Dublin Alliance\textsuperscript{6}, which seek to explore a more collaborative form of city development. Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn (DD:LL) is one such initiative. A detailed examination of this initiative forms the major case study in this thesis. Therefore, as a way of introducing this study, some background information about how this initiative came to fruition is now given.

DD:LL was conceived of and run by the not-for-profit organisation Design Twenty-first Century (D21C). This organisation was founded in 2006 by Jean Byrne, a social entrepreneur, and Jim Dunne, a graphic designer and branding specialist. They believed that the economic boom, which Ireland was experiencing at that time, was unsustainable and that new ways of operating, based on design thinking\textsuperscript{7}, creativity and innovation were needed if Ireland were to become a more prosperous nation, in the long-term (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a, Liedtka et al., 2013). In 2007, with these ambitions in mind, they travelled to Chicago to see Massive Change, a discursive exhibition which highlighted how design has been used to address some of humanity's most pressing issues, e.g. environmental degradation and climate change. They met with the creator of this exhibition, Bruce Mau, and explored the possibility of bringing this exhibition to Ireland. After some discussion, it was decided that this would not be the most fruitful way of progressing the goals of D21C. Instead, one of the co-creators of the exhibition, Vanessa Ahuactzin, was invited to join D21C as their Creative Director. Her role was to set up a 'learning project', which would teach Irish people how to use design thinking to address complex, wicked problems in an entrepreneurial manner. This was a skill that the founders considered to be badly lacking in the Irish population and they attributed this to a deficiency in the Irish educational system. A key part of their proposed 'learning project' was that students would gain first-hand experience of using a design thinking processes to address a real problem, real users and a real client, in real-time. From 2007-2008, the founding members of D21C and the organisation's newly appointed Creative Director worked in a full time capacity developing this concept.

From 2008-2009, D21C repeatedly sought support to develop their proposal from various institutions in the city. They approached all of the major academic institutions in Dublin. However, they found that they were not interested in taking part in a project which had such a nebulous target. Then, in 2008, D21C approached the head of DCC and Dublin's City Manager, John Tierney, and successfully secured his support for the project. He decided to join D21C in their endeavours for two main reasons. Firstly, he saw their proposal as offering a chance for the staff in DCC to get extensive training in design thinking. DCC

\textsuperscript{6} The non-statutory initiative, The Creative Dublin Alliance, is a network of senior representatives from Local Government, Commerce, Industry, Education, State Agencies and the Not-for-Profit Sector whose aim is to distribute solutions to challenges of citywide significance that could most effectively be dealt with through the synergies created in the Alliance. It is lead by DCC. (Dublin City Council, 2012b)

\textsuperscript{7} Design thinking is a term used to describe when a design process is applied to a problematic issue or situation which is not traditionally considered to be within the designers remit. (Brown, 2009)
Collaboratively Designing Dublin has been noted to operate in a conservative and bureaucratic manner (Gleeson, 2013, Grehan, 2013, Tierney, 2013). The City Manager wanted to challenge this dominant mode of operation by providing an opportunity for staff to learn a more lateral, entrepreneurial and user-focused way of approaching service delivery in the city. His hope was that if enough staff were trained in this way of addressing wicked problems, then they might, in turn, affect how the organisation operates and ultimately how the city operates.

'...they [D21C] thought that this whole design thinking concept had great potential and, I have to say, it struck a chord with me. One of the things I would have been trying to...find a way through, I suppose is...how do you create different mindsets in the organisation. I sometimes describe that, you know, some staff in big, institutional organisations, such as this, can become victims of structure and tradition. And there were many other things, I suppose that, that helped with our challenges, whether it's forms of public consultation with the community and how you get the community more involved in the decision making and so on, so it appealed to me in many of those fronts.' (Tierney, 2013)

Secondly, by using the revitalisation of Dublin as the wicked problem to be addressed or the subject of inquiry, the City Manager saw DD:LL as presenting an opportunity to explore an alternative way of developing the city in a more collaborative, novel and resourceful manner. This was important because due to the economic recession, DCC were finding themselves with a different set of circumstances to deal with and with a different set of requirements from the citizen. Therefore, they needed to explore different ways of meeting those requirements. As, the City Planner, Dick Gleeson noted:

'I really do think that planning may not be fit for purpose in its current form and that it's going to have to embrace, innovative, you know, smart devices for collaborative working with the citizen. When you consider that we are in an economic downturn now for 4/5 years, there are very few planning applications, as we know it from 5 years ago and there's a need for a lot of temporary uses, start-ups. And planning often finds itself not able to respond to that kind of energy. I think that there are an awful lot of people out there in the city who are doing things and who would like to contribute and somehow or another there isn't the framework to do it and a lot of activity becomes invisible as well, it is below the radar, and the local authority is not aware of it, not able to connect with it.' (Gleeson, 2013)

Having secured the support of DCC, DD:LL was born. The initiative would act simultaneously a learning project and an experimental and collaborative urban development project. It would be supported by DCC in a number of ways: through the allocation of staff to work on it full time, through the allocation of time for senior officials to partake in the projects 'steering group' meetings and through donating office space for the project. The project was partially funded by public money and partially through philanthropic means. The public money was initially secured through the conduit of DCC and, at the later stages of DD:LL, through the conduit of the Dublin Regional Authority, the body which is responsible for the overall development of the city. An initial start-up donation of €50,000 was secured from an unnamed philanthropist and this was matched by DCC when they agreed to support the initiative.
Subsequently, a further €100,000 was invested in the initiative by two other philanthropists, one of whom was one of the founders of D21C. The sum of the public money that was further invested in the project, at its latter stages, was not forthcoming. However, it was reported on Journal.ie that €40,000 was allocated by DCC to the second DD:LL project, *Love the City* (O’Doherty, 2010).

From September 2009 until May 2011, DD:LL ran two main projects. The first was a pilot project, entitled *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place* and the wicked problem, which it addressed, was revitalising Clongriffin, a suburb in North County Dublin, which had been badly affected by the economic recession. The second project, addressed the wicked problem of the decline of the city centre. It had two phases. The first phase was entitled *Discovery Phase* and this constituted desktop research and observation of this wicked problem. The second phase was entitled *Love the City* and it sought to address this wicked problem, using a similar approach as the one which was trialled in the pilot project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Location</th>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD:LL 1.0</strong></td>
<td>Finding the Hidden Potential of Place</td>
<td>Sept. 2009-Dec. 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the pilot project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD:LL 2.0</strong></td>
<td>The Discovery Phase</td>
<td>Mar. 2010 – May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Love the City</td>
<td>Sept. 2010 – Apr. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the major case study in this thesis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – The various DD:LL projects.

In July 2010, I decided to examine the approach that DD:LL used to collaboratively develop the city, as piloted in *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place*. At this time, they were just about to embark on *Love the City* and, thus, test a second iteration of this approach. I wanted to examine this second iteration of the approach, through carrying out an in-depth study of *Love the City*, for three main reasons. Firstly, at the time of deciding to undertake this research, there had been very limited documentation of the initiative; D21C themselves, had not even fully documented their approach⁸. Also, there had been no independent

---

⁸ In June 2011, after I had completed the main bulk of my primary data collection phase, D21C produced a document entitled ‘The Compendium’. This details much information about DD:LL, giving a descriptive account of the initiatives background, the concept, the project structure, the design process. It lists all the project collaborators and all of the activities carried out by the design team. The outcomes of both the pilot project, *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place*, and the second project, *Love the City*, are also described in detail. The document is largely celebratory and rarely analytical or critical. This is perhaps to be expected given that the authors are also the project founders. It does not draw any conclusions about the project overall, nor does it make any recommendations for carrying our similar projects in the future, nor does it identify what was considered to be successful or unsuccessful about the initiative as an approach for collaborative city development (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a).
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studies of it. The DD:LL website posted the day-to-day activities of the initiative and also they made an introductory video (Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn, 2010). However, both were of a promotional and descriptive nature. There was also limited coverage of DD:LL in the media and the scant coverage that did exist was also of a descriptive and celebratory nature (McDonald, 2009b, Mackin, 2010, Abbott, 2011, Murphy, 2011). Given that DCC aims to adopt a ‘collaborative approach’ as a way of reaching their long term vision for the city, it seemed like a missed opportunity not to have carried out a detailed study of DD:LL. There was a clear lack of a comprehensive description of the project and there was no consideration of it as a potential strategy for the collaborative development of Dublin. The unfortunate lack of a comprehensive description of DD:LL and its outcomes was later noted, in November 2011, on Openideo. This is an on-line collaborative design web platform, which poses design challenges to be addressed by the online community using a human-centred, design process that was developed by the design consultancy IDEO. These challenges address an issue of social importance and in this particular case the question, which was posed to the online community, was: ‘How might we restore vibrancy in cities and regions facing economic decline?’ DD:LL was posted as a piece of inspiration for this challenge and the lack of information documenting the initiative and how it worked was acknowledged:

‘Whether or not this worked, I think the model appears good and could be something to build on’. Tristan Cooke, a PhD Candidate in Human Factors / User Centred Design with Mobile Mining Equipment noted (Cooke, 2011).

The second reason why I wanted to examine DD:LL, as a case study, was because it used large amounts of public resources, being heavily supported by the local authorities in Dublin, as described previously. The third reason for focusing on DD:LL as a case study was because their approach appeared to be particularly promising considering Dublin’s economic context and its commitment to the promotion of the sustainable development using a collaborative approach. This opinion was formed after having carried out a preliminary study of the initiative. An examination of their pilot project, entitled Finding the Hidden Potential of Place, was carried out through reviewing existing documentation of the project on the DD:LL website and in newspapers, through conversations with some of the project participants and through meeting with the Creative Director to discuss my proposal for studying the project (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011b, McDonald, 2009a). The promising aspects of the initiative are examined in more detail in the Section 1.8. However, firstly, a brief description of their general approach to collaborative city development is given, along with an account of this pilot project.

---

A description of the initiative was also subsequently presented in a chapter of a book entitled Solving Problems with Design Thinking – 10 Stories of What Works, which was written two years after I completed this primary research. This description was built on information gleaned from having carried out interviews, via email, with the founders of D21C and not through having carrying out a deep, extensive and embedded study as I had done. This description is also largely celebratory, rather than analytical or critical in nature (Liedtka et al., 2013).

40
1.7.1 The DD:LL general approach described

"DD:LL is founded on a simple concept - connect Dublin’s challenges with the capacity and willingness of its citizens to improve their city, so that everyone can experience a more prosperous, enjoyable, and sustainable city." (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a:5)

To achieve this aim, they recruit a diverse team who use a design process to co-develop projects, in collaboration with local residents, businesses, organisations and local authorities. These co-developed projects all aim to revitalise the city of Dublin. The team members come from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds and are made up of a mixture of unpaid volunteers and seconded local authority staff. Together, they work full time, in a studio type environment, on developing solutions to address the revitalisation of Dublin. They are guided through the design process by the Creative Director who has extensive experience in using design processes in this way (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011b).

The particular design process that they employ has five stages. They note that these may or may not be used in a linear fashion. Also, each stage may be repeated if so desired. These stages are listed in the DD:LL literature as follows:

1. Discovery - A deep dive into researching the project area, talking to the people affected, doing ethnographic research, getting your hands dirty in the subject, looking at the area from many viewpoints and seeing it with fresh eyes.
2. Understanding - Finding the insights, opportunities and initial ideas. Discovering what the core challenges are and investigating them through possibility.
3. Ideation - Generating ideas to address the challenges, imagining future scenarios and the projects that would lead to them, sketching concepts in a quick and dirty manner, making the ideas public and shareable.
4. Prototyping - Testing out the ideas, making them real and getting the users involved in understanding their effectiveness. Iterating the prototypes, improving them each time to end up with a robust outcome. Looking at each iteration with a critical eye and constantly refining.
5. Implementation - Taking the final prototype and making it real, be it a service, product or system.’ (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a:12)

With the DD:LL approach, the initial brief to revitalise Dublin is outlined in very broad and general terms. This broad brief is then interrogated and padded out over the course of the design process. Therefore, the design process is emergent. The process concludes with creating a series of prototypical, context sensitive solutions that are developed to address the revitalisation of the particular study area. The design team work in ‘creative consultation’ with local residents, businesses, organisations and local authorities. They use the city itself as a ‘living laboratory’ in which to iteratively test the prototypes that are derived from the ‘need’ as experience on the ground in the particular study location and not by any particular disciplinary leaning. Therefore, the prototype might be an urban design, a service, a

10 ‘Insight’ is a term used in design parlance to describe moments of inspiration uncovered through some kind interaction with the user, which encourage the re-evaluation of the situation. This term will be used in this manner repeatedly throughout this thesis.
communication project or an event, whatever is deemed to be necessary and feasible to address the 'need' or 'needs' as found. They operate within a tight budget and have limited resources with which to implement the prototypes. Therefore, they make full use of existing resources. The prototype projects seek to find enthusiastic people in the community to champion the project, continuing to keep it operative after the cessation of the project. Thus, the approach aims for the outcomes to have longevity.

1.7.2 Description of the DD:LL pilot project - *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place*

In September 2009, DD:LL ran an initial pilot project, *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place*, using the above approach. The area that it focused on was the suburb of Clongriffin, an unfinished town in North County Dublin, which borders the eastern coastline. The design team 'collaborated to listen to the needs of the local residents, find ideas for the area, test these ideas and engage residents in taking ownership of the projects' (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a, p. 10). This area is archetypical of the development that occurred in Dublin during the economic boom of the Celtic tiger years, which lasted from approximately 1995-2007. In this time the physical, social and economic landscape of the city changed immensely with enormous private sector and public sector development of housing, infrastructure and business (Drudy and Collins, 2011). When Ireland entered a recession in 2008, development in the city shuddered to a halt and many building projects and building sites were abandoned in an unfinished state. In Clongriffin, only 1318 of the planned 3500 residential units were completed. By 2009, as this pilot project was being initiated, approximately 1000 residential units were occupied; however, the majority of the commercial units remained vacant. Many standard communal facilities such as meeting places, shops and some roads still remained unfinished. With such a dispersed population and given that most of the communal facilities were only partially completed, the area lacked vibrancy and vitality.

The DD:LL pilot project design team was made up of seven seconded staff members from DCC, one seconded staff member from Fingal County Council (the local authority in North County Dublin) and nine full-time, unpaid volunteers. With this diverse group, the initiative was provided with professional expertise in accountancy, architecture, arts administration, branding, business, carpentry, fashion design, interactive digital media, interior design, landscape architecture, marketing, mechanical engineering, multimedia design, politics, product design and visual communications. The project was also informed by and provided expertise by a steering group, which reviewed the progress on three occasions over the three month period of the project. This group was made up of the founders of Design 21C and high-level civil servants such as the City Architect, the Assistant City Manager and the City Planner.

Through using a version of the design process described in Section 1.7.1, five prototype projects were developed in consultation or collaboration with local residents, business owners and local DCC staff. These projects sought to revitalise this particular suburb in various ways and were based on the design
teams’ interpretation of the ‘needs’ of the people who used the area. These projects were enacted as a series of prototypes on one particular day.

Designing Dublin invites you to join us for a day of celebration!

- **GROW LOCAL**: Can we harness our knowledge, skills and resources to build local economy?
- **BUSINESS BREAKFAST**: Suite 80, Main Street, beside Centro Saturday Nov 28th - 11 am to 1 pm
- **HOTHOUSE**: Can we design, build and run a community hothouse?
- **60 MINUTE MAKEOVER**: Suite 80, Main Street, beside Centro Saturday Nov 28th - 2 pm to 4 pm
- **COMMUNICATION EXCHANGE**: Can we share local information on events, happenings, meetings, services, volunteer opportunities and culture in an exciting, easy and stimulating way?
- **BUS STOP TAKEAWAY**: The Light Box (around town) Interactive Street Screen beside bus stop on Main St Saturday Nov 28th - 11 am to 3 pm

**Figure 7** - The map of physical locations of the various DD:LL prototypes.

The prototype projects included:

- **‘Path to the Coast’**: This project was developed in response to it being unpleasant to walk around the area, there being limited access to untamed nature and there being no direct pedestrian access to the nearby coastline. It aimed to inspire local people to create connecting footpaths around the area. A potential pedestrian route to the sea was identified. The community were invited to a staged walk along the route and to participate in a co-design workshop which aimed to progress the design process. Community champions, who wanted to take ownership of the project, were identified and they were assisted by the team in applying for funding to develop the project further. They were also introduced to the landowner and developer and relevant contacts in DCC. Since the project was completed, they have held fund raising activities for the permanent implementation of the path.

- **‘Community Hothouse’**: With the proposed community centre having been put on hold, and there being no local coffee shop or other facility for people in the area to congregate in, this project sought to create a space where local residents could meet, learn, talk and gather. The
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design team identified a vacant commercial unit in the area and sought permission, of the owner, to test the locations viability as a community centre. They secured limited funding off DCC for the temporary conversion work. All of this work was carried out in collaboration with a group of residents from the area, who wanted to take ownership of the project. The project continued to grow after the design team left and currently, the ‘beta’ space is used on a regular basis by the local residents for various community activities.

- ‘Grow Local’. This project sought to create a community run, shared workspace for the local community. A cardboard prototype was assembled in a vacant commercial unit in the area, which helped raise awareness about the project. Through the making of this temporary workspace a group was established to take ownership of the project. They are still in the process of establishing this physically-shared working space.

- ‘Communication Exchange’. This project was developed in response to there being no means to communicate information that may be of interest to the public and there being limited opportunities for local residents to have conversations with each other. It aimed to instigate these conversations, by facilitating opinion sharing. It did this by creating large scale display and exchange boards at transport hubs, in conjunction with a digital notice board. The project did not find local residents to continue growing it after the DD:LL team left the area.

- ‘PlayVision’. This project was developed in response to a combination of there being an abundance of ‘dead spaces’ in the area, people feeling a lack of a sense of connection to the area, there being no outlet for the children in the area to express themselves and yet, there being an abundance of vacant shops in the area. This prototype brought together children from the area, to co-create an identity for the area based on various historical events, which happened there. These visions were then displayed in a formally vacant shop unit for a period of three months and were further built upon at subsequent workshops. This project did not succeed in finding a people from the community to continue to develop it after the DD:LL team left the area.

On foot of having carried out this study of Finding the Hidden Potential of Place, I made the diagram in Figure 8 as a way of developing an understanding of the various facets of the approach and how they related to each other. It was created in an iterative fashion, referencing the above information. Earlier iterations can be found in Appendix 7. I acknowledge that the all visual descriptions have their own unique qualities that are distinct from the written word. Therefore, I do not think that every detail of a diagram can be explained adequately through text. However, certain key aspects of this diagram are now described, through text, in order to ensure clarity in the reading of certain parts of it.
The various different actors are coloured according to their role or the organisation with which they are affiliated: the DCC staff (cyan), the unpaid volunteers (red), the users (yellow) and the D21C staff (purple). The broad outline brief, which was laid out by the Creative Director, is described by the thick black line, which extends over the timeline of the project, i.e. three months. This broad outline contains the design process, which is described with a thin black line. The exact content of the project was generated through the iterative design process, and therefore this thin black line loops repeatedly. The steering group, consisting of high level local authority staff and the founders of D21C gave input to the project at discrete occasions: see the arrowed lines jutting into the design process. The Creative Director scheduled this input, thus there are breaks in the thick black line, which emanates from her. The users of the area under examination were also invited to give input to the design process at discrete times. These interactions were also scheduled into the process by the Creative Director and again this is indicated by the breaks in the thick black lines. The design team devised methods, as part of the design process to engage the user. Therefore, the squiggly line extends outside the outline black line and into the zone of the user. Through this design process, five projects were developed to revitalise the area and these are represented by the squares on the right of the diagram. Prototypes of the five projects were created in the study location, on a particular day towards the end of the project. Through the process, three of these prototypes found 'project champions' to continue running them, after the cessation of the pilot project. This is described by the linking dotted lines connecting the members of the engaged users to the prototypes.
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Figure 8 - Components of the DD:LL model as understood from having examined the pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place, diagram by author.
A PROMISING APPROACH FOR COLLABORATIVELY DEVELOPING DUBLIN

From having carried out the cursory study of the initiative, through the examination of Finding the Hidden Potential of Place, I concluded that the DD:LL approach to collaborative city development was potentially promising. Three out of the five prototypes, which they created in Clongriffin, continued to operate after the cessation of the project. Approximately 400 residents of the area were engaged in developing the projects and 20 of these residents subsequently became project champions. It can be said to have grown social capital in the area. DD:LL have noted that '50 neighbours now know each other because of the project' (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a, p. 76). The experience of being involved in the project was, according to the design team members, both useful and rewarding (Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn, 2010). From this initial and limited study I postulated that there were particular facets of the DD:LL approach, which contributed to it being particularly promising. Here follows a brief outline of these facets.

1.8.1 DD:LL is inclusive of a broad range of actors

The approach is inclusive of input from a diverse range of actors including:

- representatives from the local authority: both on the DD:LL steering group on the DD:LL design team
- representatives from the not-for-profit sector: the founders, facilitators and co-founders of DD:LL
- representatives from the voluntary sector: the members of the DD:LL design team and members of the public who give input to the projects and help co-design the prototypes.

From having examined the pilot project, it appears that the DD:LL design process aimed to include members of the public in a substantive and imaginative capacity, inviting them to co-design the prototypes with a view to taking long-term ownership of them. However, there was limited information describing the nature of how the DD:LL design team collaborated with the other actors who partook in the design process. Therefore, it was unknown if these other instances of collaboration were of a substantive nature.

1.8.2 DD:LL employs tactics to use resources effectively

This initial examination of the DD:LL approach suggested that it aimed to make effective use of resources. As already mentioned this is a key principle of sustainable design and therefore, this aspect of the approach informs my conclusion that this is a potentially promising way to collaboratively develop Dublin. The approach made effective use of resources or aimed to 'do more with less' in three distinct ways, each of which is now described.
1.8.2.1 Tactic 1 - urban prototyping
Firstly, the DD:LL design process employs the practice of urban prototyping, where they make improvements to the city through a process of trial and error. The DD:LL design team co-developed prototypical solutions to city issues, at full scale, in the public realm, with a view to seeing how the user reacts to the prototypes. This incremental approach allows a resource light version of an ‘improvement’ to be tested for applicability, prior to the implementation of a more resource intensive and permanent implementation of an ‘improvement’. In theory, this ought to help avoid wastage downstream, preventing the creation of solutions that people do not want or that do not work in the first instance. It should be noted that this practice of full-scale prototyping is unusual in the repertoire of practitioners whose aim is to improve the public realm of cities, practitioners such as planners, architects and urban designers. Therefore, this project presented a significant opportunity to understand and assess this tactic.

1.8.2.2 Tactic 2 - DD:LL as a learning project and a city revitalisation project
Secondly, DD:LL is a learning initiative which tackles the pertinent issue of the revitalisation of Dublin. Therefore, it offers people, who want to improve their city, the opportunity to do just that while simultaneously learning how to use design thinking to address wicked problems. Thus, a win/win situation is created for both the participants and for the city. As the video describing DD:LL notes:

‘If on one hand you have all the people in Dublin who really want to learn, who’ve got skills and abilities and a lot to offer. Then if you think about all the challenges that the city faces, like food, health, transport, economy, sustainability. It’s a simple idea to put the two together. The city should be teaching its citizens to be more capable, more experienced, more confident and us as citizens should have the opportunity to influence the city as we learn. Designing Dublin, as a project, took the challenges of the city and connected them to the capacity of its citizens’.

(Designing Dublin : Learning to Learn, 2010)

This strategy is utilising the principle of what Thackara would refer to as smart recombination, where existing resources are put together in a new way in order to make them more meaningful or more valuable (Thackara, 2005).

1.8.2.3 Tactic 3 - designing seed projects to meet local needs
Thirdly, the DD:LL approach views the city as a service, the primary function of which is to meet the ‘needs’ of the user. The design team do not come to the situation with predetermined set of assumptions about how to make improvements to the area. Rather, a broad and pertinent issue is explored in a particular and limited geographical location and the design process is driven by the needs as identified there. In theory, this means that undesirable outcomes are avoided and waste is, therefore, eliminated. With such an approach the outcomes of the design process are not attributable to any one particular design genre, e.g. architecture, urban design or product design. The diversity of the background of the DD:LL design team makes this approach possible. Once the need has been identified,
the design team then develop a seed project to address that need. These projects are not fully developed, but they embody the potential to be developed by the group of people whose need it addresses. This tactic was successfully employed in the pilot project, where some of the seed projects found champions to cultivate them in the long term.

1.8.3 DD:LL strengthens institutional capacity for collaborative city development

The DD:LL approach sought to build long term capacity for collaborative city development, through their linking with DCC. As already mentioned, the City Manager wanted to address the institutional stagnation and to create ‘new mindsets’ in the organisation. DD:LL offered an opportunity for some of his staff to receive training in how to apply human-centred design processes to solve wicked problems. They would also gain experience in how to work in a diverse design team and collaborate with various other actors. The intention was that the seconded staff members would return to the organisation with a new set of tools to aid innovation and entrepreneurship in the organisation. Also, the steering group would be exposed to the DD:LL design process through the steering group meetings and this offered potential to further build capacity for collaborative city development in the organisation.

1.9 IS THE DD:LL APPROACH SCALABLE?

The examination of the pilot project revealed the above promising aspects of DD:LL. However, further examination of the approach would be necessary in order to fully understand the initiative in relation to these postulations. Also, the scalability of the approach can be questioned. Could there be several DD:LL ‘think-and-do-tanks’ scattered about the city, each focusing on improving a different and limited geographical location, using this incremental, needs-driven approach? In this way the urban realm would be seen as a constant work-in-progress, with these ‘think-and-do’ tanks consistently making and monitoring prototypes in the public realm, in accordance with the input, needs and reaction of the user. As was pointed out in Section 1.4.1, promoting sustainable development is a process of making gradual improvements. Therefore, the DD:LL approach to city development might provide an apt platform for this promotion. It is not only informed by the bottom-up perspective of the end-user. It is also informed by the top-down perspective of the local authority through the conduit of the steering group meetings. The seed projects developed by DD:LL are thus influenced by both perspectives have the potential to open up discussions, between city users and city officials, about what could happen in the public realm in Dublin. In addition, they could potentially provide a way for the local authority to test an idea for urban improvement, prior to a more permanent, more resource intensive and more costly implementation. Also, given that the steering group were closely involved in the project, there could be potential for these seed projects to inform city development policy and decisions about larger scale strategic planning processes.
With these thoughts in mind, in July 2010, I decided to carry out a more thorough study of the initiative by examining *Love the City*, in detail. This examination forms the main case study in this thesis. It is described in detail in Chapter 4, however it is briefly introduced here so as to effectively orientate the reader in Chapters 2 and 3.

### 1.10 LOVE THE CITY - AN INTRODUCTION TO THE MAIN CASE STUDY

The onset of Ireland’s economic crisis, in 2008, heralded a growing realisation on the part of Dublin City Council (DCC) that the capital’s city centre was in decline and was at risk of a concomitant spiral into stagnation. They felt it was necessary to address the currently pressing issue of the recentralisation and revitalisation of the city centre. In early 2010, having been impressed with the work carried out on the DD:LL pilot project, *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place*, DCC again engaged their services and asked them to examine a different geographical location. This time the area to be examined was the city centre and the wicked problem to be investigated was its apparent decline. Thus, in March 2010 the Discovery Phase design team, most of whom had worked on the pilot project, spent three months examining the existing situation in the city centre. Through reviewing existing and proposed plans for the city centre, through examining a broad range of existing city-wide initiatives, through conducting ethnographic research in public spaces, through interviewing various stakeholders and through examining existing data and statistics related to the city centre, the design team built up a rich picture of the current situation in Dublin and tried to unravel some of its issues. This study concluded that indeed, there was an issue with regard to the city’s demise. The design team produced a report which compiled all the findings of the study. It listed the following statistics, which supported DCC’s suspicion that the city centre was in decline:

- Footfall in the city centre was down on average 11% in 2009
- 30% of people surveyed from suburbs intend to visit the city centre less often in the next year
- The city centre was getting quieter, with 27% people shopping less
- The office vacancy rate was 21% in the last quarter of 2009, a 10% increase on the last quarter of 2008
- 763 formerly active commercial properties lay vacant in Dublin 1, 2, 7 & 8
- 95 sites lay derelict within the city centre (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2010)

On foot of this study, the design team proposed a strategy for further addressing the decline of the city centre. The goal of this strategy was firstly, to remind people of all that the city centre had to offer and secondly, to create a series of ‘urban experiences’ that were ‘full of delight’. The implicit assumption was that by doing this, the overall revitalisation of the city would be catalysed. The resultant project was aptly named *Love the City*. A new design team was recruited to partake in the project. I joined the project at this stage, as a member of the design team, in order to develop an intimate understanding of the
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initiative as a promising strategy for collaboratively developing Dublin. Details of how I gained access to the project are given in Section 3.5.1. The project lasted for a total duration of 26 weeks, from the 10th of September 2010 until the 31st of March 2011, with a three-week break around the Christmas period and I was present for its entire duration.

1.11 AIM AND OBJECTIVES
The overall aim of this research is to build an understanding of DD:LL as a potential strategy for collaboratively developing Dublin. This aim will be fulfilled by meeting the following objectives.

1.11.1 Objectives

OBJECTIVE 1: To contextualise the DD:LL approach to collaborative city development through the examination of resonant literature and practices.

OBJECTIVE 2: To describe the project, Love the City in detail.

OBJECTIVE 3: To uncover the legacies of DD:LL.

OBJECTIVE 4: To examine if the various identified facets of the DD:LL approach were as promising as initially postulated. These facets included:

- its inclusivity of a broad range of actors
- its employment of tactics to use resources effectively
- its aim to strengthen institutional capacity for collaborative city development

OBJECTIVE 5: To have analysed if the approach is scalable to the entire city.

OBJECTIVE 6: To make recommendations for future similar projects.

1.11.2 Research questions

What literature and design practices resonate with or show similarities to the approach used by DD:LL to collaboratively develop Dublin? (OBJECTIVE 1)

How did Love the City unfold in practice? (OBJECTIVE 2)

What were the particular legacies of DD:LL? (OBJECTIVE 3)

Were the various identified facets of the approach as promising as I had initially postulated? (OBJECTIVE 4)

Is the DD:LL approach to collaborative city development scalable to the entire city? (OBJECTIVE 5)

What recommendations should be given to future similar projects? (OBJECTIVE 6)

1.12 CONCLUSION
Cities are complex organisms consisting of a vast web of intricately interrelated entities. Promoting sustainable development is an involved task, which necessitates dealing with multiple competing factors simultaneously. Therefore, given the complexity of cities, promoting sustainable urban development is a highly complex undertaking. There are no simple formulas to describe how one should go about this task.
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Rather, solutions are context dependent and progress can only be made in an incremental manner, through a process of sustained negotiation with multiple different interested parties or through taking a collaborative approach. Dublin is committed to the sustainable development agenda, yet the city does not have a definitive mechanisms established to allow development to occur in such a collaborative manner. From the examination of *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place*, I concluded that DD:LL presented an apt and potentially promising approach in this regard. It appears to be inclusive of a diverse range of actors and to employ various resource effective strategies, a sustainable strategy in itself. It also has the potential to build long term capacity for collaborative city development, given the way in which it interacts with DCC. There was no academic researcher involved in examining this initiative, as a potential approach for collaboratively developing the city. There were also no independent examinations of it, despite the fact that there had been significant public resources allocated to it. The documentation of the initiative was, at the time of undertaking this research, largely of a promotional nature, having been produced and funded by D21C, the founders of the initiative. Given that DD:LL presents a potentially promising way of collaboratively developing the city, I thought it was a missed opportunity that no detailed studies of the pilot project has been undertaken. I did not want to see a similar opportunity missed with regard to *Love the City*. For these combined reasons, I decided to carry out an in-depth case study of it. The overall aim of this research is to document and understand the DD:LL approach as a promising strategy for collaboratively developing Dublin. The objectives set out how this aim will be fulfilled. There are seven chapters in this thesis, including this one. A brief summary of the content of each chapter now follows.

**Chapter 2 – Contextualising Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn**

This chapter contextualises the approach which DD:LL used to collaboratively revitalise Dublin and also explains some pertinent concepts, knowledge of which of is essential to the understanding of this thesis.

**Chapter 3 - Methodology**

This chapter presents the methodology, which was used to develop an understanding of DD:LL. The aims and purpose, the epistemological position and the theoretical perspective of this research are defined as these have informed the chosen methodology. The advantages and disadvantages of this methodology are also presented here.

**Chapter 4 – Love the City described**

This chapter gives a description of *Love the City*, creating the foundations for the analysis which follows.

**Chapter 5 – Uncovering the legacies of DD:LL**

This chapter uncovers the legacies of the initiative. These are grouped into three different categories:

- Initiatives which DD:LL had spawned
- Legacies of DD:LL which still resonate in the city
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Chapter 6 – Analysis and discussion
This chapter reflects on DD:LL as a strategy for collaborative city development. This reflection was done two years post completion of Love the City. It was informed by having carried out the in-depth case study and also through considering the legacies of DD:LL, which were uncovered through the follow-up interviews and reported on in Chapter 5. It also draws on Chapter 2, where the approach that DD:LL used to collaboratively develop Dublin was contextualised.

Chapter 7 - Conclusions
This chapter concludes this thesis and makes recommendations for how future research can build on this work.
Figure 9: ‘From the world of design, to design of the world’, by Bruce Mau (Hyde, 2012).
2 CONTEXTUALISING DESIGNING DUBLIN: LEARNING TO LEARN

‘No one should be interested in the design of bridges – they should be concerned with how to get to the other side.’

- Cedric Price (2003, p. 51)

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn (DD:LL) is a unique initiative, still various influences can be read in the approach that they use to collaboratively design the city. The broad aim of this chapter is to build an understanding of this approach and the emerging field of design practice in which it is situated, through the identification and description of explicit influences. Then, resonant literature and design practices, which may have implicitly shaped it, are also noted. Thus, through this contextualisation a knowledge base is established within which to consider DD:LL as an example of how Dublin can be collaboratively developed in practice.

The chapter is divided into seven parts. Firstly, the terms ‘design’ and ‘design methodology’ are examined. Secondly, the design philosophy and the design methodology of the Bruce Mau are discussed as he explicitly influenced DD:LL. Thirdly, the landscape of design practice in which DD:LL can be situated, i.e. design for social good, is described. Fourthly, considering that design for social good is, by its nature, inherently human-centred, the landscape of human centred design in general is explored. Fifthly, the concept of ‘city design’ is described, as DD:LL could be considered to be an instant of city design. Sixthly, urban design concepts, which the author has identified as having implicitly shaped DD:LL, are noted. And finally, a selection of existing projects/design organisations that exhibit a striking resemblance to DD:LL are identified and briefly described.

2.2 UNDERSTANDING DESIGN, DESIGNING AND DESIGN METHODOLOGY

Given that the term ‘design’ is used repeatedly throughout this thesis, it is critical to establish an understanding of it. The goal here is not to have an extensive discussion about the nebulous nature of the term, but rather to acknowledge how it is understood in the context of this thesis. To develop an understanding of DD:LL as a model for collaborative city development and because the term ‘designing’ is in the title of the project under examination, the activity of designing is also considered in more detail. Therefore, a brief description of the evolution of design methodology is given to illustrate how various people have come to understand this activity. This description aids in contextualising the particular design related activities and design processes, which were used in DD:LL. However, firstly it must be noted that there are multiple ways in which the term ‘design’ can be used. It can be used to describe a field or discipline, e.g. graphic design, fashion design, product design, car design, and it can also be used
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to describe a plan or blueprint devised to attain a specific goal. Additionally, the term ‘design’ can be used to describe an end product. And, finally, it can be used to describe the process used to create that end product (Heskett, 2005, Chick and Mickletonwaite, 2011).

According to Herbert Simon’s seminal book, ‘The Science of the Artificial’, design is central to what humans do. He characterises design as a human activity that aims to control nature by creating the artificial world to ensure man’s survival. Therefore, design, he argues, is concerned with imperatives and how things ‘ought’ to be, unlike the sciences, which are more concerned with reality and how things ‘are’ (Simon, 1969/1996).

There are innumerable different interpretations of what design is as a field of endeavour. Rather broadly, Heskett (2005, p. 5) has stated that design is ‘the human capacity to shape and make our environment in ways without precedent in nature, to serve our needs and give meaning to our lives.’ Berger (2010) has come to a similar broad conclusion about the nature of designing, having explored numerous different understandings of the term as given by various prominent designers. For instance, he has noted that Clement Mok, the award winning designer and former Creative Director at Apple, has said that design is ‘the act of giving form to an idea with an intended goal: to inspire, to delight, to change perception or behaviour’; Victor Papenek, a pioneer in the realm of socially responsible, has stated that design is ‘the conscious and intuitive effort to impose meaningful order’; and Bruce Mau, the renowned design thinker, has stated that design is ‘the human capacity to plan and produce desired outcomes’ (Berger, 2010, p. 29). After having reviewed many such definitions, Berger has concluded that the recurring themes in all definitions include planning, purpose, and the intention to make a situation better11. This view corroborates with Simon’s understanding that design is concerned with imperatives. Cross also noted this aspect of design, when he sought to establish design as a discipline distinct from the sciences and humanities, as discussed in Section 2.2.1.

Cross (2011) has noted that we are all designers to some extent. Yet some have a more developed ability to design than others. In light of this understanding, it may be useful to note how Chick and Mickletonwaite (2011) have established a distinction between ‘design thinking’ and ‘design craft’. They point out that the term ‘design thinking’ was first coined by Colin Rowe (1991) and subsequently propagated by design consultancy IDEO (Tischler, 2009). It is most often used to describe when a design process is applied to complex subject matter which is not traditionally seen to be within the remit is design. In this regard, they note that everyone has the ability to ‘design think’ to some extent. ‘Design craft’, however, is the ability to translate the outcome of this design thinking process into an end product and this is a learned skill, which is developed and honed over time.

11 Design is a value-laden activity. Therefore, when design intends to make a situation better, the improvement is dependent on the designers personal values and worldview.
2.2.1 The evolution of design methodology

As previously stated and detailed in Section 1.5.1, DD:LL used a particular design process to develop solutions to city-wide wicked problems. This particular design process was established against a backdrop of almost five decades of investigation into design methodology and design methods. Various researchers have elaborated, in detail, on the chronological development of these investigations. Therefore, an in-depth discussion of design methodologies is not be repeated here (Cross, 1984, Bayazit, 2004, Tan, 2012). However, a brief summary of the historical development of design methodology is produced as a way of setting the context for examining the particular design process that was used by DD:LL.

The Design Methods Movement was initiated in the 1960's and concerned itself with the study of the activity of designing and the subsequent production of systematic procedures for the design process (Cross, 1984). The main protagonists in this movement were John Chris Jones and Christopher Alexander, who set about codifying the design process and developing new design methods to help deal with the growing complexity of the modern world (Cross, 2001, Bayazit, 2004). Jones also noted that codifying the design process is a way of externalising the hitherto private process of the designer, therefore making it easier for other stakeholders to contribute to the design process (Jones, 1971/1992). His proposed design process is based on a three stage procedure comprising analysis, synthesis and evaluation. The first step in the process is analysis of the design problem through breaking it down into constituent parts. This is followed by synthesising of the deconstructed information and putting it back together in a new way. Then, the new combination of deconstructed and synthesised information is implemented and the subsequent results are tested (Jones, 1971/1992). Jones had intended these design processes to act as a supplementary aid to a more traditional design approach, which had grown from a practice of craft and was, therefore, based on intuitive reasoning and experience. He had intended for a more formalised design process to provide a rational framework within which the irrational activity could occur, thus supposedly increasing the reliability of the overall process. However, this dualistic aspect of the codified design process was misunderstood and interest grew in creating a science out of design and solidifying a coherent, rationalised, design method, devoid of opportunities for irrational activity (Cross, 2001, Bayazit, 2004). These efforts to create a science out of design culminated in Herbert Simon’s publication of ‘The Science of the Artificial’ (Simon, 1969/1996). In this book, he proposed applying the scientific
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approach to the artificial, man-made world – the subject matter of all design activities. This reflects an inherent positivist stance and an assumption that design problems are rational problems, to be solved using rational processes.

In the 1970's Alexander and Jones reacted strongly against their self-created Design Methods Movement, with Alexander claiming that the study of design methodology had become an 'intellectual game' and an end in itself. He alleged that the field of design methods had lost sight of its original task, which was to make better end-products (Bayazit, 2004). Jones also rejected the movement for issues concerning the preoccupation with the rationalisation of the design process (Jones, 1971/1992).

In 1973, Rittel and Webber reframed planning problems, which are essentially design problems, as ill-defined, contradictory and multifaceted. They referred to these types of problems as 'wicked' - not in the sense of being diabolical in nature, rather they that they are messy and distinct from the types of 'tame' problems that scientists and some classes of engineers deal with in neat, controlled laboratory settings. There are an innumerable set of solutions to a wicked problem and consequently, they require the designer to make a value judgement. Also, solutions to wicked problems are unique and cannot be tested therefore, there is no opportunity to learn through iteration (Rittel and Webber, 1973). An examination of first generation design methods ensued, critiquing them for being too inflexible given the nature of the wicked problem. In the first generation design processes, the initial stage concerned the apparently exhaustive collection of all information about the problem, decomposing it into its constituent parts. This was followed by the analysis of this information and this in turn was followed by the solution proposition. Such a method is not valid when one considers the problem to be ill-defined. With ill-defined problems, not all information pertaining to it can be collected. This new definition of the design problem gave way to a second generation of design processes, which prioritised user involvement in an 'argumentative' design process (Bayazit, 2004).

This reframing of design problems as wicked problems, also prompted a series of empirical research studies into what designers actually do in practice, viewing this activity as a natural occurring phenomena. For instance, Darke (1979) carried out semi-structured interviews with architects, inquiring about their design process. She concluded that architects narrow the ill-defined problem by formulating 'primary generators' early in the design process. These 'primary generators' might be a design concept, or a limited set of objectives, which, as well as providing a starting point for the architect, also help to provide constraints to limit the scope of the design. Lawson (1979) also investigated what designers actually do through experiment. He devised a study that consisted of giving a group of postgraduate architectural students and a group of postgraduate science students a range of coloured blocks. The blocks were to be arranged according to a set of rules. Lawson noted that the architects tended to learn about the problem through trying out solutions, whereas scientists set out to find out about the problem only. He concluded that that scientists tended to solve problems by a process of analysis,
whereas designers tended to solve problems by a process of synthesis. Such studies claim that the original premise for attempting to create a science out of design may be ill-founded, because scientists and designers have differing cognitive strategies. They have lead Cross to propose establishing design as an independent discipline, distinct from the sciences and the humanities (Cross, 1982). He claims that designers have their own particular way of operating, their own particular way of gaining knowledge about a problem, which he calls 'designerly ways of knowing'. The particular attributes that make design distinct from the humanities and the sciences, are set out in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomena of Study</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>The Natural World</td>
<td>Controlled experiment, classification, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Human Experience</td>
<td>Analogy, metaphor, evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>The Artificial World</td>
<td>Modelling, pattern forming, synthesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Nigel Cross contrasted design with sciences and the humanities (Cross, 1982).

This 'designerly way of knowing', as described by Cross, has parallels with Schön's description of the 'reflexive practitioner', who thinks about the problem while working on solving it (Schon, 1984). Through this reflexive practice, the understanding of a problem and the solution co-evolve simultaneously as the situation is constantly framed and reframed based on the emergent understanding.

Yet, regardless of the doubts about whether a design process can be explicitly codified or formalised, many contemporary design researchers and design firms continue to create models of design processes to add to the plethora that already exist. Dubberly (2004) has complied over one-hundred models of design processes which were formulated between 1939 and 2004. The creators of the models that he illustrates include academics, design consultancies and software developers. Some of these models illustrate a linear design process, which combines a series of steps of analysis and synthesis similar to those created by John Chris Jones. Other design processes illustrated are cyclical and iterate a series of steps of analysis and synthesis. One of the more well-known design processes that Dubberly illustrates is that of the design consultancy, IDEO. This design process has five stages including:

- Observation: understanding the user experience through observing people, behavioural mapping, interviewing and hosting 'unfocused' groups.
- Brainstorming: idea generation based on the observation.
- Rapid Prototyping: mocking up quick models of ideas and rapid testing of those models.
- Refining: narrowing down to more suitable ideas and further prototyping of those ideas.
Later Tim Brown, the CEO of IDEO, describes a simplified version of the above process as iteratively passing through three metaphorical spaces of activity. According to Brown (2008), these spaces include:

- **Inspiration**: observation of the situation, framing the challenge, examining precedent projects, consideration of 'extreme' users, e.g. the elderly or children.
- **Ideation**: brainstorming for ideas, building creative frameworks out of the chaos, early prototyping, integrating ideas.
- **Implementation**: implementing the project in reality.

Whereas, IDEO suggest that the ideation should follow initial observation of the situation, other designers promote the idea that the ideation phase of the design process should take place at the initial stages of the project, when the designer is unhampered by constraints that would be revealed though the process of observation and investigation of the design situation. This approach would thus allow the designer to take the opportunity to engage in more authentic 'blue sky thinking' and is strongly advocated by the design thinker, Bruce Mau (Berger, 2010). He was particularly influential in shaping the approach to collaborative city design used in DD:LL. The Creative Director of D21C, Vannesa Ahuactzin, who developed DD:LL, was a former employee of Bruce Mau Design, a graduate of his postgraduate course in design at the Institute Without Boundaries\(^\text{13}\) and a collaborator with him on *Massive Change*, the highly acclaimed discursive exhibition, which explored the future of design (Mau et al., 2005). Given his influence on the initiative, his design approach, his design philosophy and his design process are discussed in more detail in the following section, thus furthering the contextualisation of DD:LL.

### 2.3 EXPLICIT INFLUENCES ON DD:LL – BRUCE MAU DESIGN

#### 2.3.1 Bruce Mau’s design approach and design philosophy

Bruce Mau originally trained as a graphic designer and, in his early career, he focused on book design. He is well renowned for his contributions in that field, particularly for his collaborations with the architect Rem Koolhaas (Koolhaas and Mau, 1995). However, his more recent work tends to deal with more complex subject matter, where he is less concerned with creating objects - specific to his disciplinary training - and more concerned with creating experiences to make the world better\(^\text{14}\). Berger has investigated and described his design methodology in the book entitled *Glimmer – how design can transform your business, your life and maybe even the world*. This book seeks to highlight how design, both product and process, can be used not merely to satiate market demands, but as a way of acting on

---

\(^{13}\) For a more in-depth description of The Institute Without Boundaries see section 2.3.1.1.

\(^{14}\) Mau never defines explicitly what he means when he uses the word ‘better’.
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the world with the intention of improving it and subsequently realising and giving appropriate, and not discipline specific, form to those intentions (Berger, 2010). Mau is identified as a key contemporary designer who works in this way. He is an outspoken proponent of the notion that there is no problem too big or too complex for a design process to address. Everything, in his view can be reinvented and made better through the application of a design process, which he claims will facilitate the finding of new solutions to old problems. Therefore, his work ranges from designing a better future for the country of Guatemala, to creating more sustainable products for Coca-Cola, to redesigning a city in the Middle East, to rehabilitating former drug-dealers back into society (Bruce Mau Design, 2011).

In 2004, Mau’s thoughts on how design could be used to make situations better were solidified when he, in collaboration with the Institute without Boundaries and George Brown College, Toronto, created the discursive design exhibition entitled Massive Change (Mau et al., 2005). In 2002, Mau was requested, by the Vancouver Art Gallery, to create an exhibition, which would explore the future of design. At the same time he was considering launching an experimental postgraduate program in design for George Brown College. He decided to merge the two projects, setting up an ‘entrepreneurial learning program’ in which the postgraduate students tackle a ‘real world challenge’ using a design process. The ‘real world challenge’ that the students addressed was to help him create the exhibition for the gallery. Mau was the main mentor in this postgraduate course and he guided the students through the design process. The resultant exhibition showcased how people were using design (both product and process) to address some of the most profound contemporary challenges, such as environmental degradation, population growth, peak oil and climate change. The exhibition itself was arranged according to themes, each displaying designs from various design disciplines. Thus, the visitors to the exhibition were guided through a range of products arranged under five different themes: environment, commerce, education, transportation and housing.

The exhibition states that ‘Massive Change is not about the world of design; it’s about the design of the world’. This thought has been reiterated by Mau many times since. For instance in 2012 he stated:

‘The real invention of Massive Change was to disconnect the methodology of design from the visual, to look at design as the capacity to produce a specific future. One of the great challenges I face in doing the work that I’m trying to do is that when I say the word ‘design’, people think of singular authorship and fancy expensive things. They think ‘OK, this is somebody doing things that are going to be really expensive.’ (Hyde, 2012, p.30)

The intention of Massive Change is also summed in the image at the start of this chapter, Figure 9. This sketch by Mau illustrates his thesis about how design can be used to make all situations better, rather than merely creating products to satisfy market demands.
Overall, **Massive Change** proved to be very popular among the design community and it eventually took the form of a website, book, catalogue and travelling exhibition. Yet, it is not without its critics. It has been pointed out that it merely displays products that will save humanity from many impending global issues; however, it neglects to address the factors that have perpetuated these problems. Celebrating the most positive side of consumerism, it fails to acknowledge how capitalism is inherent in the problem (Weinberg, 2007, Langman, 2008). ‘In Massive Change’s future, we will somehow save the world without altering our buying habits, lifestyles, or the economic inequities that made the project necessary in the first place.’ (Weinberg, 2007: 88). Weinberg also notes that the project pays little attention to the full range of sustainability concerns, in particular the social equity issues involved in creating some of their showcased products and solutions, and therefore the exhibition can be regarded as case of green-washing. However, Margolin, notes that despite such critiques, the exhibition still has merits and points to new routes for designers, who are concerned about the state of the world, to engage with thorny issues in a constructive manner (Margolin, 2007).

### 2.3.2 Bruce Mau’s design process

In 1998 Mau wrote ‘An Incomplete Manifesto for Growth’, a design manifesto which outlines 43 points to aid designers in developing their own design process. In it, he promotes an intuitive approach to designing, one which is not overly prescriptive. Thus, he places great importance on random experimentation. The 43 points are more akin to tactics for design, rather than explicit design strategies and range from imitating others, to listening carefully to all collaborators on a project, to embracing mistakes, to asking ‘stupid’ questions. He views the naivety of the designer (as the non-expert) as an asset, a source of creativity, which allows her to view the design situation with fresh eyes. He promotes the idea of maintaining a sense of openness and flexibility in the design process and encourages close collaboration with others. He prioritises the design process over the outcome. He is sceptical about using technology urging designers to think with their mind, not with their tools (Mau, 1998). Since the manifesto was published, it quickly became a viral phenomena (Berger, 2010).

In Mau’s design process the first stage consists of creative brainstorming and coming up with ‘wild ideas’, expressing them in some form (sketches, collages, prototypes etc.) and pinning them on the surrounding walls of the design studio space to serve as constant inspiration throughout the design process. Mau believes that this initial ‘blue sky’ thinking is very important in the design process, as it allows the designer to come up with original ideas, unencumbered by data and convention, which will be uncovered at a later stage. This work is then followed by some form of empathic research and immersion in the context in which the design will be situated. Mau is also a proponent of developing a design through sketching and making, claiming that this activity helps to give form to an idea. Sketching, he explains, can have a sense of clarity that words cannot (Berger, 2010). Mau also insists on retaining a sense of openness throughout the design process noting:
The idea is to start out thinking of original ideas and solutions, then take those ideas out into the field to see if they match up with what people are thinking and saying, while always remaining open to new ideas that might emerge in the research and cause you to change direction'. (Mau cited in Berger, 2010, p.19)

Mau also notes that when working on social problems, the designer must look at the challenge in the larger context, as it may be interrelated with several other problems. It is not just about designing the object anymore, everything exists within something else. If the designer does not ‘expand the problem’, they might end up solving one aspect of it while making another aspect worse. It is about systemic design. Everything is connected (Berger, 2010). Mau also believes that contemporary wicked problems cannot be solved by an individual designer, working in the way they did when the issue of concern was the creation of discrete products. Rather, such problems require teams of people, from a variety of backgrounds, tackling them together. Mau claims that the idea of the designer as the lone genius is a myth that is no longer either operational or helpful (Hyde, 2012).

Recently, Mau finished working in his design studio, in order to pursue his ambition to teach, to as wide an audience as possible, how design can be used to address wicked problems or how to use what he terms the ‘lost in the woods’ methodology. He has explained this methodology as follows:

‘So in education, your job is not to deliver the content, because you already have the content. Content is all available now. What you’re really delivering is the experience of how to manipulate this content. We call it a ‘lost in the woods’ methodology, because when you’re lost in the woods, everything in the environment is important; it is information that is live and is relevant and can help you get out. That’s what a designer does. A designer starts lost in the woods and has a methodology or orientation to get to a destination. That’s what an entrepreneur does’. (Mau cited in Hyde, 2012, p. 37)

With this goal in mind he created the Massive Change Network. It provides training and workshops in the ‘lost in the woods’ methodology, where participants work in transdisciplinary teams and use action-based research to address a real world problem. The design process used in DD:LL was heavily influence by Mau and also used the ‘lost in the woods’ methodology, see Figure 10.
2.4 DD:LL AND DESIGN FOR SOCIAL GOOD

2.4.1 The contemporary landscape of design for social good

Bruce Mau is not the only contemporary designer who is using design thinking to address the thorniest of contemporary challenges with a view to improving the situation. Over the past 10 years there has been significant growth in this emerging field of design practice. Increasing numbers of designers are disregarding the traditional practice of design, which is primarily market-driven and consumer-led and mostly directed at improving the aesthetics or functionality of a product or service. Instead such designers are advocates of using design and design processes to address social issues or a social need, whether in the interest of altruism or activism. Such endeavours go by various different names, by various different people. Tan has given a comprehensive review of these differing design genres which include service design, design for social innovation, transformation design, design activism, sustainable design and design for development among others. Collectively she refers these areas of endeavours collectively as ‘design for social good’ (Tan, 2012). For reasons of clarity and simplicity, this research also uses this term to refer to this area of design activity.

However, thinking about design as having responsibilities beyond those of market concerns is not just a recent phenomenon. In the late nineteenth-century, the Arts and Crafts movement, led by William Morris, called for design to prioritise human values over industrial concerns. The Bauhaus Movement, initiated in the 1919 and led by Walter Gropius, also had a significant social agenda. Later in the century, Buckminster Fuller urged designers to simultaneously address ecological and social concerns and to refocus their efforts away from market concerns towards making the world a better for all of humanity (Fuller, 1969). Then, just over forty years ago Victor Papenek, made a plea for design and designers to become more socially responsible when he wrote the seminal book entitled ‘Design for the Real World’
Collaboratively Designing Dublin (Papanek, 1972). The ideas contained in this book were influential in marginal, left-of-centre design practice, but they never really took hold in mainstream industrial production. In the 1990's, Buchanan revived the discussion about how design and design thinking could be used to address wicked problems (Buchanan, 1992). However, it was not until the last century that the practice of design for social good became more common, spurred on by the writings of Victor and Sylvia Margolin, Nicola Morelli and John Thackara (Margolin, 1998, Margolin and Margolin, 2002, Thackara, 2005, Margolin, 2007, Morelli, 2007).

Emilison et al. (2011) have pointed out that whereas the early pioneers in the realm of socially responsible design were focused on producing products and technologies, contemporary designers working in this way are more focused on creating services, systems, organisations and policies. They refer to this area of contemporary design endeavour as 'design for social innovation'\(^{15}\) and have identified three influential/pivotal locations where this type design practice has emerged from: the UK, the US and Italy. These pivotal locations, as identified by Emilison et al. are now briefly summarised.

In the UK this emerging field of design endeavour is referred to as Transformation Design or Service Design. In 2004 The British Design Council set up a 'do tank' called RED who developed 'innovative thinking and practice on social and economic problems through design innovation'. Their approach, entitled transformation design, uses participatory design methods in combination with rapid prototyping, which is employed from an early stage in the design process as a way of generating user feedback quickly. They have used this approach to create, for example, more effective healthcare, to reduce energy use in the home and to combat prisoners re-offending (Burns et al., 2006). The British Design Council has also initiated other programs which helped to grow this field of practice such as Design of the Times (Thackara, 2007) and Public Services by Design (The Design Council, 2008, The Design Council, 2013). There are also many UK based design companies working in this area and who have benefitted from public support through the conduit of the Design Council e.g. ThinkPublic (2011), Engine (2013), Live/Work (2013), Participle (2013). The Politecnico de Milano has also spawned much activity in this area, under the leadership of Ezio Manzini and Francois Jégou (Manzini et al., 2008). Together they have used design methods and design processes to highlight existing 'creative communities' who are already practicing social innovation in a way that makes everyday living more sustainable. Manzini also founded DESIS, a global network linking people who are working in the area of design for social innovation (DESIS, 2013). In the US, design thinking is also being used to address social issues. However, unlike the UK, the issues being addressed in the US are not of a local nature and are usually associated with the third world. This type of design is referred to as design for development (Smith, 2007, Borland,

---

\(^{15}\) They use Murray's definition of social innovation where he describes it as 'new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations. In other words, they are innovations that are both good for society and enhance society's capacity to act'. This research will also use this definition of social innovation. (Murray et al., 2010, p.3)
It has been popularised by Tim Brown, CEO of design consultancy IDEO, who claims that design thinking is capable of developing ‘better solutions to social problems’ (Brown, 2009, Brown and Wyatt, 2010). Emilison et al., (2011) note that the DESIS Lab at Parsons The New School for Design in New York along with Project H use a more ‘European model’ of design for social innovation and address social issues closer to home (DESIS Lab Parsons, 2013, Project H Design, 2013a).

Given that design thinking has been touted as being capable of tackling the most complex of contemporary problems, it is not surprising that public bodies around the world have shown interest in using design thinking to address social issues and to catalyse social innovation (Bason, 2010). Over the past 10 years, numerous government innovation labs that use design thinking for these purposes have been established (Parsons DESIS Lab, 2013). For instance, La 27e Région is a French organisation that aids regional governments to collaboratively create projects to address social issues such as health, employment and education by forming temporary laboratories where teams of civil servants, designers and citizens co-design new solutions (La 27e Région, 2008-2013). Some local authorities have in-house social innovation laboratories who use design thinking as a way of creating new solutions for social issues such as SILK (Social Innovation Lab for Kent) in Kent County Council, the UK (SILK, 2013). The Danish government also has an in-house public service design lab who describe themselves as ‘the cross ministerial innovation unit which involved citizens and businesses in developing new solutions for the public sector’ (MindLab, 2013). The British National Health Service has also recognised the potential of using a design approach to improve their services and therefore they worked with the service design agency ThinkPublic. Together they have developed more innovative services based on principles of human-centred design and rapid prototyping and they have entitled this type of work as ‘experienced-based design’ (Bate and Robert, 2007).

2.4.2 The limitations of design for social good

Although design and design processes have been heralded as being able to cure any contemporary wicked problem, many have expressed concerns over the limitations of design for social good and they are worth considering before examining DD:LL as an approach for collaboratively developing Dublin. Geoff Mulgan (2009), the Chief Executive of the National Endowment for Science Technology and the Arts (NESTA) has listed the strengths and weakness of design for social innovation. He has noted that design processes can help reframe the problem in a new light, can provide novel insights and visualisation skills, can illuminate the user perspective, facilitate rapid prototyping and provide tools for thinking about the issue in a systematic way. He noted that the weaknesses associated with design for social good are the high cost of design consultants and their lack of commitment once the contract is completed. He noted that designers’ tend to lack critical implementation, economic and organisational skills. He argues that they need to employ more rigorous systemic thinking skills and that they need to learn from other professions, such as social entrepreneurs and policy makers.
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Reservations have been aired about the practice of design for development. Some see it as a type of new imperialism, where designers from the west impose their designs on less well off people in the third world (Stairs, 2007, Nussbaum, 2010, Borland, 2011). Questions arise with reference to the degree of empathy and understanding that the designer from a foreign country can apply to a localised issue. Although DD:LL was situated in Dublin, with the city itself being the focus of the design process, these reservations about design for development are worth bearing in mind when developing an understanding of DD:LL. Essentially, this issue highlights that design is value laden and that designers, therefore, need to be cognisant of their own values, which they bring to bear on the design process. Given that there is an infinite number of solutions which can be applied to any design problem, how a designer goes about solving that problem depends on how she frames it and therefore, on her particular worldview.

Thorpe and Gamman (2011) have noted that Papenek’s call for design to become socially responsible is naive. They point out that in the majority of cases the designers role is predominantly shaped by clients who are in turn predominantly driven by market concerns. Therefore, the designer does not have the authority to set any agenda - political, social or otherwise. They also point out that even when the designer’s principal aim, as stipulated by the client, is to improve the social situation, they still do not have ultimate authority and cannot, therefore, be entirely responsible. This is because design for social innovation employs a co-design process, which is inclusive of multiple actors/co-designers. In any situation, where multiple stakeholder agendas are concerned, there is always an element of compromise. Therefore, the designer cannot be solely responsible for the outcome. They argue that all the designer can expect to be is responsive to the design situation. In conclusion, they note that the designed outcome can only strive to be ‘good enough’, given the constraining parameters. They also advise that design for social innovation ought to take an assets based approach over a needs based approach. With a needs-based approach, the designer acts in what could be considered to be a dogmatic manner, articulating what they perceive to be social needs to be addressed with their design intervention. In such an approach, the voice of the designer is audible over the person or group in receipt of the design service. Whereas, with an assets-based approach, the designer works with willing collaborators, leveraging existing resources in order to reach a collective goal. It is thus less dogmatic than the former. They also mention the contentious issue of remuneration of the non-expert/co-design partners in design for social innovation. They note that it is an area that needs consideration if design for social innovation is to become a sustainable model.

Tonkinwise (2010) has issued a word of caution, pointing out the potentially unexpected repercussions of design for social innovation. He has noted that when ethically minded designers do voluntary work to promote social innovation, they may inadvertently support a neoliberal ideology. For instance, if through
Their work they improve the functionality of a public service, then future funding streams for that particular service may be reduced. Overall this may result in a diminished role for government.

Blyth and Kimbell (2011) have highlighted another issue with using design thinking to address social issues. Designers, they have noted, often use personal stories to gain insights and to drive the design process forward. Yet, they do not have tools to situate these individual stories within a dynamic social system or to create an aggregated meaning from them to form a collective story. They question why and when personal troubles can and should become issues of public concern. In this sense, they argue that design for social good has much to learn from sociology. Also, they note the designer's tendency to always produce a solution to 'solve' the social situation might not always be necessary. They promote the idea of seeing design not just as a problem solving activity, but also as problem-framing activity. Through the use of a design processes, the problem itself can be constructed or reconstructed and brought into focus in a new or novel way.

2.5 THE LANDSCAPE OF HUMAN-CENTRED DESIGN RESEARCH

DD:LL can be considered to be an instance of design for social good. It is only logical that a human-centred design approach is taken in such endeavours. The landscape of human-centred design research is populated with a variety of methods and approaches. In order to contextualise the particular methods used in DD:LL, this landscape is now described.

Sanders and Stappers (2008) have mapped the terrain of human-centred design research. This map is worth discussing as it presents a way of locating and understanding the human-centred design research methods used by DD:LL. They note that there has been a trend evolving in recent years, in the design sectors, whereby designers are working ever more closely with the user. However, they point out that designing with the user is not a new idea and has existed since the early 1970's under the name of participatory design. They note that since the 1970's design methods and approaches, which aim to incorporate the user at increasingly earlier stages, have evolved where the user contributes not only to usability testing, but also to the generation of ideas. They propose that the contemporary landscape of human centred design research can be considered on a scale ranging from where the user is the subject of research, to where the user is a partner in the research. The former has evolved from design research methods in the US and the latter with design research methods in Northern Europe. Design research can also be examined as being led by design, issues of conjecture and 'what might be', to being led by research, issues of the nature of 'reality' and 'what is'. The various design research methods and design research approaches can then be mapped as depicted in Figure 11.
Figure 11 - The landscape of human-centred design research (Sanders and Stappers, 2008).

It is worth mentioning cultural probes here, as they clearly influenced some of the research methods used by DD:LL. A cultural probe is an interactive device, given by the designer to the end user, as a means of introducing the parties to each other. The device is consummated by the end users performing some task on it and returning it to the designer (Gaver et al., 1999). In product design, it has tended to take forms such as a set of postcards to be filled in by the end user and returned to the designer, a disposable camera for the end user to record some aspect of their life, or a ‘media diary’, which is like a scrapbook, to help people record particular aspects of their lives. Cultural probes are designed to provoke inspirational responses, to lead a discussion towards the unexpected, to glean new insights and to open up a space for new cultural forms and new forms of pleasure. Therefore, they are concerned with gleaning insights about ‘what ought to be’ rather than data about ‘what is’. According to Gaver et al. (2004), cultural probes were the invention of ‘artist/designers’ rather than ‘scientist/designers’. Therefore, the information obtained from the returned cultural probes should be taken as the inspiration for further design work, rather than as data to be analysed. Returned cultural probes are not summarised. Instead, the designer takes inspiration from the particularities of each and every returned probe. Rationalising cultural probes, they claim, diminishes their particular effectiveness and in summarising probe returns, particular and inspiring items tend to be subsumed by the generality of the sample.
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Steen (2011) has built on Sanders and Stappers framework for understanding the landscape of human-centred design research, as illustrated in Figure 11. His classification of the various different approaches is now expanded on, as it helps orientate the discussion about the research methods used by DD:LL. Steen also maps various human-centred design research approaches according to whether they are concerned with reality and 'what is' or conjecture and 'what could be' and whether the user is a partner in the design process or the subject of design research. He describes participatory design research as research where the users are seen as experts and invited into the design process, at a stage as dictated by the designer, as a way of including and utilising their tacit knowledge and thus furthering the design process. Codesign is described as research where the users and the designers create the project together and the users are involved in the project from the moment of inception or from the 'fuzzy-front end'\(^{16}\) of the process. Ethnography is described as the activity where designers 'go into the field' to understand how the product or service is currently being used. Contextual design research is where designers 'go into the field' to understand how the product or service is currently being used. Then, they translate this understanding into specifications for a new product or service. Lead user design is where users, who are familiar with customising a product or service, are invited into the process to help move the design process forward. A common example is where extreme sport enthusiasts, who customise their equipment themselves, are interviewed and asked to test new equipment. Empathetic design research is where the designer attempts to understand the user, to reflect on this understanding and then to brainstorm and develop prototypes based on this understanding. It differs from contextual design in that the designer makes practical intervention in the design context in order to extract insights about 'what could be'. An example of such an intervention is a cultural probe. Steen's map of the landscape of human-centred design approaches is shown in Figure 12.

\(^{16}\) The 'fuzzy-front end' of the design process, it a term used in design parlance to refer to the stage of the design process when the brief and the project are ill-defined.
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Steen notes that each human-centred design approach has its benefits and limitations, distributing the designer’s power and agency in particular ways. He highlights two distinct areas of tension in all human-centred design endeavours. Firstly, he notes the tension that exists, for the designer, between listening to the user’s knowledge, experience and ideas and utilising their own knowledge/experience and ideas. Secondly, he highlights the tensions that exist for designers between understanding the existing situations or past practices and their proposing future/possible practices (Steen, 2011). His advice for the designer choosing a design approach is to be considerate and mindful of these tensions and the way each design approach deals with them.

2.6 DD:LL AND AS AN EXAMPLE OF CITY DESIGN

Sanders and Stappers (2008) have pointed out that recent growth in interest in human-centred design had been accompanied by a growth in interest in designing for a purpose rather than designing for a particular end-product. They have stated that architecture and planning are the last of the traditional design disciplines to become interested in exploring this new design territory. Perhaps this is because, as noted in the prologue, these design disciplines are reputed to be primarily concerned with the creation of perfected abstract forms in lieu of dealing with the numerous social issues, which exist in the real world (Till, 2009). One such issue that has been often ignored, since the birth of the modernist architecture and planning, is the needs, wants and desires of the user (Jacobs, 1962). However, there
have been alternative approaches proposed for improving cities, approaches that prioritise the user. One noteworthy example of this type of practice is what Kevin Lynch termed 'city design'. Therefore, a description of this proposed practice now follows, as it resonates with the approach used by DD:LL and thus offers a way of describing their approach.

Kevin Lynch, the well-renowned American urban theorist, conceived of the concept of 'city design' in the 1960s. He saw his normative approach as a more comprehensive, human-centered, and contextually sensitive alternative to the then more common practices of urban design and city planning, which he critiqued for the following reasons (Lynch, 1966/1995). Firstly, he criticizes the practice of the city planning for using statistical and mathematical modeling techniques to predict what would happen in cities and only to shape the city to suit the predicted situation. Lynch considers such an approach to city development to be lacking in ambition. Secondly, he criticises the practice of implementing 'bold' or 'radical' proposals. He notes that although grand, sweeping modernistic schemes have a sense of clarity and purity, they tend to pay little attention to the local context. Thirdly, he criticizes the practice of the planner, who plays the role of disseminator of information, giving the most up-to-date data about how the city operates to external agencies so that they can make the best decision possible about or for their particular plot. Such a liberal approach, according to Lynch, pays little attention to the common good. Fourthly, he critiques the practice of producing alternative designs for a particular location, whereby the process, through which these designs have evolved, is not described. Such practice, he claims, renders their inherent objectives opaque. This can lead to an 'either/or' situation, with little opportunity for debate about how applicable the design is for the chosen location. He notes that all of the above practices for improving cities explicitly avoid using objectives. He also notes that when planning departments do utilize objectives, they tend to be too general and therefore, too difficult to judge if they are being satisfied. In his 1968 essay entitled 'City Design and City Appearance' Lynch gives a first description of the nature of city design as an activity. He explains that such an endeavor is concerned with 'the general spatial arrangement of activities and objects over an extended area, where the client is multiple, the program indeterminate, control partial and there is no state of completion' (Lynch, 1968/1995).

He notes that the difficulty associated with such a form of design is that it might be considered to be so complex and uncertain that some critics would think of it as impossibility. However, he points out that a city is a man-made landscape and therefore it must be designed and, if it is to be designed, it could be manipulated so as to enhance the lives of its inhabitants rather than to hinder them. Later in this essay, he notes this admittedly complex field of design is in need of much development.

In his paper entitled 'City Design: What It Is and How It Might Be Taught' Lynch expands on his notion of what city design is and notes that it has much in common with city planning, but that it has a more humanistic purpose (Lynch, 1980/1995). As with city planning, city design concerns itself with the design
of public works, regulating private action in the public realm and the zoning of legally defined uses. However, it also includes the programming of activity and character, the designing of prototypes for elements of the city and the making of ‘framework plans’. It engages inhabitants in environmental education and participatory design and it concerns itself with the management of the city and the building of institutions of ownership and control. City design, he notes, is not solely concerned with the design of large elements, but also deals with the design of small things, such as paving, planting, front-porches and signage. However, it differs from architecture and landscape design in the way it considers its products to be connected over space and time and not as discrete entities. Therefore, he notes that a city design is formed and communicated via policies, programs and guidelines, and not via blueprints.

Before his death in 1984 Lynch wrote about ‘The Immature Arts of City Design’ (Lynch, 1984). In addition to the three already established, top-down practices which aim to improve the city - urban design, city planning and city conservation - he offers six other modes of practice which can be used. One of these approaches is particularly apt as a way of thinking about and describing DD:LL. This is ‘renewal’, which he describes as ‘refurbishment’, ‘tinkering’ and ‘redoing’, where parts of the existing urban landscape might be improved upon in a piecemeal fashion, or discrete elements might be inserted, such as planting, lighting, graphics or shelters. He notes that existing renewal practices need to connect with ordinary residents and that they should be based on the human experience of a place rather than the implementation of an abstracted notion of a professional or an administrative division. Architecture, according to Lynch, tends to be object orientated and a form of personal expression of the architect. City design, on the other hand, can be seen as a form of collective design, which operates within a persistent framework, i.e. the existing context. It also deals with complex and extensive material, has a pluralistic audience and is perpetually unfinished. In this way it is more akin to landscape design, whereby the landscape designer accepts that his design will grow and possibly mutate over time.

Shane has traced how the concept of city design has evolved from Lynch’s inception of the term in the 1960s (Shane, 2005). He notes that in 1999 the term ‘city design’ re-emerged in John Kaliski’s essay entitled ‘The Present City and the Practice of City Design’ (Kaliski, 1999). However, Kaliski makes no specific reference to Lynch who coined the term. In a similar way to Lynch, Kaliski proposes the concept as an alternative to then contemporary practices of urban design and urban planning. He notes that even though such practices try to emulate the vitality of the everyday city, their resulting outcomes often fall short of that everyday reality. He claims that this is because they fail to authentically engage with the messy reality that is the contemporary city and are more concerned with abstract design ideologies. For Kaliski, architecture, rather than urban design, offers a better starting point for city design because it deals with the specifics of places in a way that urban design does not.

City design for Kaliski is about creating small-scale, physical, strategic interventions that seek to incorporate and address the complexity that is the contemporary city. Such interventions redefine the
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eexisting situation as beautiful and use this new definition as inspiration for the design process. He acknowledges that such an approach to city design sees each person as constructing place through carrying out acts of everyday life, such as taking a new route to work, pasting a new sign over an existing sign or organizing a community meeting. The architect as city designer would help facilitate these acts by creating enabling frameworks in which they can occur. Such frameworks, he notes, would be informed by the dialogue that the city designer initiates with the user.

The approach used by DD:LL for improving the city has resonances with the concept of city design. It too offers an alternative model for developing cities, whereby many alternative spatial solutions are generated to address a set of objectives. DD:LL also use multiple design techniques and their solutions recognize that the client is multiple, the program indeterminate and the control partial. The act of carrying out city design through renewal is a particularly apt as a way of thinking about DD:LL, where discrete parts of the existing urban landscape might be improved upon in a piecemeal fashion. Kaliski's sees the city as a work in progress, a project which is constantly reconfigured through everyday acts of engagement. The approach adopted by DD:LL, also views the city in this way, where seedling projects, which are ready to be adopted by the inhabitants of the city, are created.

2.7 DD:LL AND INFLUENCING URBAN DESIGN CONCEPTS

The influence of some particular urban design approaches can also be read in the way in which DD:LL aim to improve the city and a brief description of these approaches is now given. This is an emerging field of practice, therefore, it is acknowledged that this list of influences is not exhaustive, rather a sample of these resonant urban design approaches is offered to further aid in the contextualisation of DD:LL.

2.7.1 Urban acupuncture and planning by projects

The design concept of 'urban acupuncture' appears to have resonances with the approach used by DD:LL to improve the city. This concept is used to describe the process through which cities are regenerated with the placement of thoughtful, strategic, small interventions at critical points throughout a city. It is based on the premise that even small interventions can have a large effect if they are implemented in a strategic manner. Such an approach views the city as a series of overlapping systems. The concept proposes that when the designer builds an intimate understanding of these systems, she can then make a micro-intervention, which can act as a catalyst for large scale positive change. The coining of the term can be traced to the Finnish architect, Marco Casagrande (Kaye, 2011 ). Jamie Lerner, the architect and ex-mayor of Curitiba, popularised the term and famously employed the tactic from 1960-1990 when he converted the run-down city of Curitiba, Brazil into an icon for how sustainable development can be promoted with minimal cost (TED, 2007). Manzini and Rizzo have also elaborated on how the tactic can be used in an incremental manner to achieve large-scale sustainable change. They note how these small
interventions need to be linked in a strategic manner to a larger vision for the city, i.e. to a type of framework project which can support and guide these interventions. They refer to this strategy for creating sustainable cities as planning by projects or acupunctural planning and define it as:

'...constellations of interrelated small-scale, short term projects that the authors call local projects, coordinated, synergised and amplified by larger initiatives that the authors call framework projects; their overall outcomes are large-scale transformation processes'. (Manzini and Rizzo, 2011, p. 200)

Nabeel Hamdi, a leading practitioner in urban participatory development, describes a similar tactic in his book entitled 'Small Change – About the art of practice and the limits of planning in cities'. He gives several examples, primarily from the third world, of how discrete and often improvised, bottom-up, interventions can have a hugely positive effect for overall urban development. For example, he illustrates how a well placed bus stop can spawn a thriving local economy (Hamdi, 2004). Through forming a deep understanding of context, people, place, networks, systems, politics and existing resources, he seeks to unlock the potential of a place and design interventions to allow for a series of positive chain reactions. His approach can be seen as designing for emergence, with the goal of having local people taking long term ownership of the project.

The approach that DD:LL employ could be viewed as an example of planning by projects or acupunctural planning. At the initial stage of their design process they focus on developing a deep understanding of a specific geographical location and how it works. Then they proceed to create a number of discrete interventions or instances of urban acupuncture, which aim to catalyse a revitalisation or renewal process.

2.7.2 Tactical urbanism and do-it-yourself (DIY) urbanism

The influence of the practice of DIY urbanism and tactical urbanism can be read in the way in which DD:LL make interventions in the public urban realm. In DIY urbanism, entrepreneurial citizens make self-initiated, one-off, unsolicited and unauthorised interventions in public urban space with the intention of improving it in some way or another. Popular examples of such activities include guerrilla gardening, whereby underutilised urban spaces are planted with flowers or vegetables, or Hobo QR Codes where QR codes are graffitied into the public realm to act as a warning signs for impending danger (Ho, 2012). DIY urbanism and tactical urbanism differ slightly in their intentionality. Tactical urbanism is more systemic than DIY urbanism. According to Lydon et al., tactical interventions do not intend to be singular acts. Rather, they are implemented as a way of testing an idea before longer term implementation takes place. Parklets are an example of tactical urbanism. This is where a piece of pavement is temporarily converted into a small park using mobile seating, planting and painting the asphalt, thus providing a low cost test case of a micro-park. This is then evaluated, before considering longer term implementation.
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(Lydon et al., 2012). DD:LL employs similar tactics as DIY urbanists, implementing small-scale, low-tech interventions in public space with the aim of improving the functionality of the place. The practice of urban prototyping, which DD:LL employ, is very similar to tactical urbanism, in that an idea is tried out in a temporary manner with a view to testing its validity, before embarking on a more permanent implementation.

2.7.3 Spatial Agency: an emerging alternative spatial practise

Spatial Agency is a project which has collected and categorised over 130 examples of spatial design practitioners (architects, urban designers and planners) working in the arena of design for social good, while using spatial design tactics (Awan et al., 2011). The project refers to such spatial practitioners as ‘spatial agents’, who are working with the idea that the best solution to spatial problems might not always be buildings - an idea that was first espoused by the infamous, avant-garde architect, Cedric Price. One example of such a group of spatial agents is 00:/, a London based company founded by a self professed ‘reluctant’ architect, Indy Johar, who pursues the agenda of economic, social and environmental sustainability. He works in a way that is quite different from traditional architecture practice and designs whatever he deems is necessary to move the sustainability agenda forward, rather than automatically designing a building. He states that ‘the challenge is not whether you do a real building or not, the challenge is whether you are making places better’ (Hyde, 2012, p. 47). Lacaton and Vassal are also categorised as spatial agents. They are a Parisian based architecture firm who maintain that the first question the architect to ought to address is if any physical product is needed at all. They were famously employed to make a proposal to improve a public square in a residential area in Bordeaux. After months of deliberation, they concluded that the best solution was to do nothing, because it was beautiful and complete just as it was. The concept of the designer as the spatial agent bears some similarities to the design approach employed by DD:LL, in that they also use spatial tactics with the end goal of improving the status quo.

2.8 SIMILAR PROJECTS TO DD:LL

Initiatives that use a design for social good based approach to revitalise a specific geographical areas are now described. These place-based projects or initiatives bear particular resemblances to the approach used by DD:LL to revitalise Dublin.

- **La 27e Région** is a French not-for-profit organisation that aids regional governments to collaboratively create a series of discrete, projects to address social issues such as health, employment and education. They form temporary laboratories where teams of civil servants,

---

17 For more information on 00:/ see www.architecture00.net/blog/
18 For more information on Lacaton and Vassal see (Lacaton and Vassal, 2013)
designers and citizens co-design new solutions to address these issues. They also use human-design processes to co-develop policy recommendations (La 27e Région, 2008-2013).

- **Studio H** is a design education program established by the nonprofit organisation Project H Design. In Studio H, high school children learn about design processes and apply those processes to the challenge of improving the public life of their physical surroundings. They build, full-scale, ‘real-world’ projects to ‘spark community development’. Project H was begun in the underprivileged location of Bert County, North Carolina in 2010. The design outcomes of Studio H consisted of a new playground, an award winning structure for a farmers market, school gardens, an obstacle course and public chicken coops (Project H Design, 2013b).

- **Design of the Times (Dott)** was a UK based design program that sought to develop solutions to social, economic and environmental challenges working in collaboration with the local community and using co-design design processes. It was created by the British Design Council. The first Dott program focused on the North East of England and was led by John Thackara. The second Dott program focused on Cornwall and was led by Andrea Siomak. The outcomes of both programmes included a series of twenty citizen projects, a skills programme and policy recommendations (Thackara, 2007, Tan, 2012).

### 2.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter has given an account of the landscape of design theory and practice in which DD:LL can be situated. Firstly, a discussion about the nature of design was had and a brief account of the evolution of the understanding of design methodology was given. This informs the general appreciation of the approach used by DD:LL for revitalising Dublin. It also informs the methodological choices made in this thesis, which are discussed in Chapter 3. Then, an account of the design philosophy, approach, practice and process of Bruce Mau was given, as he explicitly influenced DD:LL. This account helps to contextualise the particular design process employed by DD:LL, which is based on his ‘lost in the woods methodology’. The broad, contemporary field of ‘design for social good’, which has seen significant growth since the turn of this century, was then examined. DD:LL can be located in this arena. Then, the practice of human-centred design was examined. This section informs Chapter 6, where Love the City is analysed and discussed and helps build an understanding of the design methods which were employed throughout the DD:LL design process. Kevin Lynch’s concept of city design was then described as DD:LL can be understood to be employing a city design approach, through the act of what he terms ‘renewal’. Resonant contemporary urban design approaches were then described, to aid in the further contextualisation. Finally, this chapter highlighted some key and individual revitalisation projects which bore particular resemblances to DD:LL. In conclusion, it was noted that there is much happening in the contemporary design world, which has both implicitly and explicitly informed DD:LL and their approach.
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to revitalising Dublin. DD:LL is reflective of a growing interest in the design community in human-centred
design practices and design for social good. It is also reflective of an increased adoption in the urban
design community of the strategy of creating small-scale, strategic interventions, which aim to catalyse
large-scale change. DD:LL is a sizeable experiment in these emerging arenas of design and has potentially
much to offer in terms of developing these fields.
Figure 13 - The reflexive journals compiled throughout this research process.
3 METHODOLOGY

'As for predictive theory, universals, and scientism, the study of human affairs is, thus, at an eternal beginning.'


3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the methodology, which was employed in this research. Methodology is understood as 'a general approach to studying the research topic' (Silverman, 2009, p. 334). The overall aim of this chapter is to document the journey through which this research process travelled in as transparent a manner as possible, acknowledging important contingent factors that helped shape its development. Therefore, as Silverman suggests, it communicates 'the natural history of the research' (Silverman, 2009, p. 335). All choices, which were made with regard to methodological issues, were also influenced by, informed by and bound up with the epistemological position and the theoretical perspective, along with the research aims and purposes. These choices are identified, described and elaborated upon. Following this, the methodology is described and the pertinent issues associated with this methodological choice are examined. The intention is not to present an exhaustive discussion about all the possible permutations, of all possible challenges that could be associated with the chosen methodology, but rather to highlight some central issues which became particularly pertinent over the course of the research evolution. The data collection methods, which were employed at each stage of research, are then described and the justifications for choosing each particular data collection method are presented. The ethical issues, which were encountered while using each data collection method, are discussed. The approach, which was used to analyse this data, is also described. In the final section of the chapter the generalisability of the results is considered. The following chapter is presented in the first person and not in the passive voice, as this format is seen to be appropriate considering my epistemological position and theoretical perspective.

3.2 THE RESEARCH AIMS AND PURPOSE

Although, Chapter 1 details the purpose and aims of this research, they are now be briefly recapped upon in order to highlight how they helped shape the methodology used.

In September 2009, I joined a multidisciplinary team of researchers whose broad aim was to investigate the sustainable development of Dublin with a view to making a pragmatic recommendations for

---

19 In the authors opinion, the use of a passive voice is more closely associated with taking an objectivist stance and a positivist approach, where a value-free description of reality can be given in a detached manner. Whereas, the use of the first person is more reflective of the subjective position, a constructivist stance and an interpretivist approach, which was taken in this research.
promoting this agenda. As noted in the prologue to this thesis, I came to this research with a personal interest in investigating how city users could become involved in publicly funded urban revitalisation projects in a more substantive, creative and meaningful manner than what was, at that time, possible. Taking into account the overall agenda of the research project and my own personal interests, I decided to narrow the scope of the overall research agenda and focus on the nexus of participation and sustainable urban development using the city of Dublin itself as an anchor to help ground the research. During the first year of my PhD studies, I read broadly around these topics and attended many conferences, lectures and events which helped further my understanding of this area. I also built up an awareness of initiatives, activities and projects that were being undertaken by academic institutions, DCC and independent research groups at that time, all of which related to my general area of research.

I carried out an initial broad literature review of sustainable urban development and participation. This revealed that there were limited opportunities, as provided for under statute, for people to influence the development of Dublin. However, the city development plan acknowledged that, to work towards their long term vision of a sustainable Dublin, a collaborative model of development, one which recognises the value of citizen engagement, must be employed. In 2009, in the wake of the economic bust and as the dust began to settle on the many half-built and abandoned building sites, there was a surge in creative activity in the city. Many different groups of artists, architects and designers held public discussions, lectures, exhibitions, forums, workshops and colloquia to discuss the future of the city and how we might respond to the many challenges that the economic downturn presented. I became an active member in some of these design groups and forums for two reasons. Firstly, out of a sense of social obligation and as a committed Dubliner, who was concerned about the fate of the city, I wanted to do what I could to help prevent further urban decay. Secondly, I wanted to further my research investigation and many of these initiatives were looking at alternative ways to develop the city. It was through one of these discussion forums that I came in contact with the initiative, Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn (DD:LL), and some of the members of the design team. At that time, their pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place, as described in Section 1.7.2, had just been completed. It struck me as a unique initiative and a potentially promising example of how the city could be collaboratively developed in practice, so I decided to investigate it further. However, I found that there was limited documentation of the initiative. Therefore, I tried to familiarised myself with it through attending their public exhibitions, their open-studio days and their public presentations, all of which sought to showcase their work.

---

20 For example Shadowland, an exhibition and conference that generated alternative proposals for the many abandoned building sites throughout the city and the associated discussion forum with the exhibition curators and the Minister of the Environment.

21 I held exploratory design workshops with the organisation Now What?, a design forum based in the School of Architecture in University College Dublin, that sought to explore the future of the built environment in the wake of the economic boom, using a variety of spatial practices (Clancy et al., 2009). I was also an active member in the forum entitled Creative Cities – a difficult question, which discussed and dissected the notion of the creative city with regard to the current challenges facing Dublin (Byrne, 2009).
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Through attending these events, I built up a better understanding of their approach. It seemed to be an apt way of collaboratively revitalising the city, in a meaningful and hands-on manner. The justification for coming to this conclusion has already been discussed in Section 1.8.2. Although this initial study helped me develop a cursory understanding of the initiative, I still felt that I lacked a comprehensive and deep knowledge about their approach. I wanted, through my research, to explore this initiative, to develop an intimate understanding of it and to use this understanding to communicate, in as clear a manner as possible, how it could be viewed as an example of how Dublin could be collaboratively developed in practice. Therefore, as the purpose of this research evolved, I decided to conduct an in-depth study of DD:LL. I wanted to get as close as possible to the initiative and to provide a description of it from the inside. This case study can therefore, be viewed as having both exploratory and descriptive aims. Robson (2002, p. 59) has noted that the purpose of exploratory case studies is ‘to find out what is happening, particularly in little-understood situations, to seek new insights, to ask questions, to assess phenomena in a new light and to generate ideas and hypotheses for future research’. He has also noted that descriptive case studies seek to ‘portray an accurate profile of persons, events or situations.’

According to Crotty, the methodologies and methods chosen in social sciences research are guided by both the purpose of the research, along with the theoretical perspective of the researcher, which is in turn informed by the epistemological position of the researcher (Crotty, 1998). I used this framework as the scaffolding on which to develop my research methodology. Therefore, my epistemological position informed my theoretical perspective, which in turn informed the methodology chosen. All three of these elements of this scaffolding are now described.

3.3 THE RESEARCH EPISTEMOLOGICAL POSITION

Given that the subject matter under investigation was a real-world situation, I felt that an objectivists stance, characterised as providing value-free knowledge, obtained through quantitative evaluation, was entirely inappropriate. The social world is more unpredictable than the natural world (Robson, 2002). There are so many variables in the social world, because people are conscious, impulsive beings and who all have their own interests, values and desires. I, therefore, rejected the view that absolute, quantified ‘truths’ about the social world can be established and took a constructivist stance. Such a stance acknowledges that there is no external reality independent of human consciousness and that there are only different sets of meanings and classifications, which people attach to the world and which people construct from their worlds and from the objects in their worlds. Crotty points out that in constructionism meaning is constructed, rather than discovered. He has defined constructionism as:

‘the view that all knowledge, and therefore, all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context’ (Crotty, 1998, p. 42)
3.4 THE RESEARCH THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Taking a constructionist stance, it follows that the theoretical perspective that informs this research is interpretivism (Thomas, 2010). The interpretivist approach seeks to develop an understanding of the social world, rather than establishing consistent and unerring laws about it. It is more concerned with exploring individual phenomena, uses primarily qualitative methods and 'looks for culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world' (Crotty, 1998, p. 67). Taking such a theoretical perspective, I acknowledge that I offer a somewhat partial description of the approach used by DD:LL. Although this description is subjective to some extent, it endeavours to be informed and strengthened by multiple other perspectives as a way of addressing and acknowledging my own subjectivity. Therefore, various methods of triangulation were employed and these are described in Section 3.6.3.

3.5 CONTEXT FOR THE METHODOLOGY

As well as the aims, purpose and theoretical perspective, there were a number of contingent factors which helped shape my research methodology. As advised by Silverman, these are now acknowledged (Silverman, 2009). On the 5th of August 2010 Vanessa Ahuactzin, the Creative Director of Design Twentyfirst Century (D21C), the not-for-profit organisation which established DD:LL, gave a public lecture describing DD:LL in the Science Gallery at Trinity College Dublin. I attended this lecture to further develop my understanding of DD:LL and the approach which they use to collaboratively develop the city. The outcomes of the pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place, were presented. It was noted that, on the foot of this project, DCC commissioned the DD:LL design team to investigate the apparent lack of vibrancy and vitality in the city centre, an observation that corroborated with quantitative data showing a decline in footfall there. This investigation, entitled the Discovery Phase, was also presented at the lecture and the Creative Director announced it would form the basis of a second iteration DD:LL. This time the wicked problem, which the initiative would address, was the revitalisation of the city centre and it was aptly entitled Love the City. This second iteration of DD:LL would last for a duration of six months, from September 2010 to April 2011. At this lecture, it was announced that they were seeking applications from volunteers who wanted to partake in the project. I saw partaking in the project, in this capacity, as an opportunity to immerse myself in DD:LL, to examine their approach in an intimate manner, to gain an insider's perspective of it and to experience, first hand, how their approach to collaborative city development worked in practice. Thus, I was presented with a unique opportunity to develop a better understanding of it and, at the same time, a chance to make a positive and pragmatic contribution to aid in the development of this promising initiative.

I decided that I would undertake what could be viewed as a naturalistic enquiry, by partaking in the project as a volunteer, thus becoming an embedded member of the design team (Silverman, 2009). Lincoln and Guba have summarised the characteristics of such a mode of enquiry as follows:
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- that the research is carried out in a natural setting,
- that the researcher is and other participants are the primary data gathering instruments,
- that the research has an emergent quality and theory is built as the research progresses, and
- that the applications are tentative and not broad ranging.

Such an approach, they claim, seeks to give a richly textured description of the subject under investigation, by being there in 'space and time' with the belief that phenomena can only be understood within their own environment or setting (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). One of the earliest and well known examples of a naturalistic inquiry is 'Street Corner Society', where the researcher gives a detailed account of an Italian American slum in the late 1930s, by becoming involved in the action of that world as a participant observer (Whyte, 1943). It is not enough in a naturalistic enquiry to get a close up view of the situation under examination; rather the researcher must become involved in the situation and understand it from various perspectives, thus giving an insider's view of the situation and exposing the inner workings of that realm (Gubrium and Holstein, 1997). Whereas, the classic naturalistic inquiry looks into the lives of the people, I wanted to look into the life of DD:LL as an entity, to study it holistically. Yaneva carried out a similar investigation, as a participant observer, in the architectural office of 'The Office of Metropolitan Architects' (Yaneva, 2009). Through her analysis of multiple interviews and ethnographic material, she builds a reading of how design is carried out in that office and then she offers a description of this reading using the format of the short story.

3.5.1 Negotiating access to the inner realm of DD:LL

The first step in my research investigation process was gaining access to Love the City. Therefore, the day after the DD:L public lecture just described, I emailed the Creative Director outlining a proposal to examine their initiative as an example of how the city could be collaboratively developed in practice by volunteering on Love the City as a full-time member of the design team. The Creative Director requested that we meet to discuss the proposal further. This meeting was also attended by three other D21C employees. These employees had taken part in the pilot project as volunteers and they informed me that they were going to be design team leaders on Love the City. At this meeting it was decided that, in theory my proposal had merit. There were potential benefits for the initiative, the academic community, for design practitioners and for the city. I pointed out that DD:LL would benefit in that they would have a full time researcher to aid in contextualising their design approach and to record the process. I would benefit in that I would have the opportunity to develop my research and my understanding of how Dublin could be more collaboratively developed in practice. I also noted that this research would be of benefit to the academic community, design practitioners and for city officials. However, the Creative Director stipulated that if I wanted to become a fully embedded member of the design team, I would have to compete for a place on this team and therefore go through the same application process as all the other interested applicants. This was seen to be necessary two reasons. Firstly, they wanted to ensure that I was a suitable participant for the project and that I could work effectively with the other design team
members. Secondly, they wanted to ensure that I would be accepted, by the other participants, as an equal member of the design team. This presented my research with a significant challenge. I now had to contend for a place on the team and there was no guarantee that I would be offered a position. The application process was quite extensive and I was required to submit:

- A completed application form detailing educational background and work experience.
- A personal expression of creativity, accompanied and an explanation of how it reflected my 'creativity'.
- A letter of intent, detailing the motivations for wanting to partake in the project and also describing what I believed to be the biggest challenges facing the city centre.
- Two reference letters.

Applications were received from 97 people and 32 of these applicants, including myself, were called for interview where our ability to work in a team, to problem solve and handle pressure were assessed. During the interview, I was challenged to design, develop and test an idea, at full-scale, in the public realm, for encouraging people to use and visit the city centre more. This task was carried out in a team of six people and all the design activities were continuously monitored by the Creative Director and two other D2IC employees. There were also two other interviews, the first of which was formal and carried out in a traditional style, with an interview panel consisting of the founder of D2IC, one of the design team leaders and the City Planner. The second interview was less formal and sought to assess my ability to think on my feet and improvise while under pressure. This was assessed by one of the design team leaders and Ré Dubhaigh, the founder of Radarstation, a service design consultancy that helped develop the service design industry in the UK (Radarstation, 2013).

On the 30th of August 2010, I received a phone call from the Creative Director whereby she offered me a place to partake in the project, as a member of the design team. She noted that although she was aware that I would be investigating *Love the City* as a case study for my PhD research, she would still require me to be completely committed to the project. She expressed that being a full member of the design team would in itself, be very demanding. She noted her concerns about my ability to balance the demands of my PhD research with the demands of the project. I assured her that although I would carry a notebook and a camera with me all the times, as a way of recording significant events and items of interest, I would give the project my full dedication. I informed her that all work, specifically associated with my PhD, would be undertaken outside of the DD:LL working hours. I also guaranteed her that my expanded diary entries would be completed after these hours. Giving her this commitment meant that I would volunteer on the project for a total of six months, in a full-time capacity, working Monday to Friday, from 09.00-17.00. In light of the demands being placed on me by the Creative Director, I felt it was necessary to reassess my research methodology.
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I had to question whether or not I would be able to produce any objective knowledge taking into account that I would be so intensely involved in the project, as fully embedded member of the design team. I wondered if my primary role in the project was as more of an insider rather than an outsider. I questioned whether there would be any way to counter the tendency to ‘go native’ or whether I would, in fact, need to ‘go native’ in order to ensure that the project progressed smoothly. I felt that for ethical reasons, I needed to give DD:LL my full dedication, so as to ensure that I didn’t hamper its development and stand in the way of its success. The potential growth of the other design team members, the D21C staff and the city were at risk if I didn’t pull my weight on the design team. In order to unravel this conundrum and to help develop a strategy for this research project, participant observation and design research, as methods of data collection, were examined. This examination helped me clarify how I might negotiate playing both roles, as an insider and as an outsider, simultaneously. It also helped highlight some thorny areas to be aware of when undertaking such endeavours.

3.6 THE CASE STUDY RESEARCH METHODS

The main research method, which I employed, can be considered to be a hybrid of participant observation and research through design. Therefore, both of these research methods are now examined.

3.6.1 Participant observation

Participant observation is where the researcher becomes a participant in the condition under study. As a method of data collection, it has its origins in anthropology. Traditionally, the participant observer investigated a tribe, custom, culture or habit. With this research method, the researcher carries out her investigation through direct observation. Informal interviews may also be carried out with people who are partaking in the research situation. Vinten (1994) has highlighted that the organisation can be seen as a tribe and therefore participant observation can be used as an apt method to investigate its inner workings and to look at its structure. It is with this view of participant observation in mind that I considered using it as a way to understand DD:LL, taking a role in Love the City as part of the design team and as a participant observer. The main advantage of participant observation as a research method is that it is immersive and is carried out in a natural situation as opposed to in the laboratory. Therefore, there is a lack of artificiality and it thus purports to allow the researcher to gain a deeper and more intimate understanding of the research situation than if it had been viewed in a detached manner from the outside. Therefore, the participant observer aims to unearth what actually happens in reality as opposed to what is supposed to happen according to theory or a laboratory experiment. As a method it is more often used to answer questions of ‘how’ as opposed to ‘how many’ (Robson, 2002, Thomas, 2010).

The literature notes that carrying out participant observation presents some challenges. Some of these documented challenges helped inform and shape the research. It has been noted that the participant
observer must strike a delicate balance between remaining detached enough so as to provide a somewhat objective reading of the situation, while simultaneously she must become embedded enough to enable the formation of critical insights. Many have noted that the participant observer can be susceptible to over-rapport and subsequently ‘going native’. This has implications for the acuity of the results (Silverman, 2009, Robson, 2002). In participant observation, the researcher and the other participants are the research instruments. Humans are by their nature biased and therefore, the validity of the research may be questioned by positivist researchers. To help deal with this shortcoming, it has been suggested that the data obtained through participant observation should be triangulated with other data (Vinten, 1994, Robson, 2002). The presence of the participant observer may affect the actions of the people observed. Therefore, the participant observer must be aware that they might cause potential damage to the observed situation. There are also practical issues associated with carrying out participant observation. The researcher may not always be able to maintain absolutely rigorous research procedures, i.e. you cannot always break away from a conversation to take notes. Data handling is an issue associated with this method and it has been pointed out that there may be a time lag between the recording of the data and the writing of the findings, thus further complicating the method (Jackson, 1983). Participant observation can also be very time consuming, given that Robson advises to take notes on the spot and as a rule of thumb to elaborate on those notes within 24 hours or before the next observation session starts (Robson, 2002).

3.6.2 Research through design

The relationship between design and research is vague. To add some clarity to this relationship, Simonsen et al., have developed a conceptual framework to help to identify the different ways to view this relationship (Simonsen et al., 2010). This model is built on ideas which were first posed by the design research theorist, Nigel Cross. They have noted that there are three distinct ways of viewing this relationship. The first understanding of this relationship is ‘research for design’ where research is carried out separately from the design process and the research findings are then incorporated into the design process at a specific instant. The second understanding of this relationship is ‘research into design’, where researcher seeks to understand how designers work in practice. The third understanding of this relationship is ‘research through design’ or ‘design through research’. This is where research is produced through the act of designing and designing is done through the act of research or it is ‘about the complex and multi-directional integrations of research and design, where design becomes as much a medium and process of research, as a result’ (Baerenholdt et al., 2010, p. 3-4). Therefore, in this third understanding, the boundary between design and research is blurred.

The overall investigation being carried out in this thesis could be viewed as ‘research into design’ where I am seeking to understand DD:LL as an example of how the city could be collaboratively developed in practice. However, because I was a participant in the Love the City, who worked on the challenge of revitalising the city centre using a design process, the research method employed could also be viewed
as 'research through design' and 'design through research'. I acted on the phenomena that I wish to understand and, through acting on it, I developed my understanding of it. Thus, through being a designer on the DD:LL design team, I tested their approach to collaborative city development, figuring out where it could crack, bend or break and testing its limits; I was also able to contribute to the development of DD:LL, offering opinions and advice, throughout the design process, about how their approach to city revitalisation might work better. The advantage of carrying out this research as a design researcher is that I would be able to contribute more to the formulation of the initiative. However, the disadvantage is that I might be too involved in the development of the DD:LL and this close involvement might compromise my ability to see DD:LL in any kind of impartial way.

3.6.3 Deal with the challenges associated with the research methods

3.6.3.1 Dealing with my subjectivity

My bias toward making a positive and constructive contribution to DD:LL was a necessary element of the research methodology. Design is concerned with how things ought to be rather than how things are. Therefore, the goal of all design is to pursue desired effects. It follows that, as an authentic member of the DD:LL design team, I had to try to produce beneficial outcomes for the city and, therefore, to make DD:LL operate in as effective a manner as possible. If I had not acted in this way my presence may have adversely affected the other design team members, and consequently, the products of the design process. This bias is also, perhaps, inevitable given my disciplinary background, which is described in the prologue to this thesis. Having trained and practiced as an architect for many years, I bring with me an instinctive 'designerly' mindset.

Acknowledging this bias is the first step that I took to deal with it. However, I also had to incorporate some practical measures to keep my subjectivity in check. The Creative Director had reiterated how demanding the project would be. Therefore, I had to be diligent about devoting time to reflect on the research situation. Based on my fieldnotes, which I took throughout the day, I made expanded diary entries every evening after the project was finished. At this time, I also reflected on the activities of the day. Initially, I had wanted to deal with my subjectivity through the constant and automatic photographic recording of activities. Before the project began, I informed the D21C staff about my intention to wear a 'sensecam' for the duration of the project. This is a small camera, with a fisheye lens that automatically and silently takes pictures every 30 seconds. It is worn on a chord and hangs around the user's neck. It was developed by Microsoft for people with memory deficiencies. If the photographs are reviewed at the end of each the day, memory recall can be improved by up to 30%. The Creative Director had repeatedly stated that the working pace of the project would be rapid. In such a hectic environment, I thought that having an automatic recording device would have been beneficial. It was my intention to use these recordings to aid my own memory recall, to provide an alternative record of the activities and to supplement and inform my diary entries. However, the Creative Director and the team leaders requested
that I did not wear the camera as they wanted all recording of the project to be done in an overt manner in line with the ethos of the project, which espoused openness and transparency. Therefore, I had to reconsider this element of my research strategy. I decided I would have to rely on my supervisor and research group to provide me with alternative readings of my research as it progressed. Therefore, throughout the six months of carrying out this field research, I had regular meetings with my PhD supervisor, after the Love the City working hours, who offered impartial view of the approach, as a way of countering and addressing my subjectivity. With this in mind, I also presented the ongoing research to my peers in TCD at a monthly lecture series and regularly discussed the ongoing research with my research group within TCD.

As well as writing diary entries and reflecting on the project each evening, further opportunities for reflection emerged, as the field work progressed. At the beginning and end of each working day, the entire design team had a briefing and debriefing session which lasted approximately 20 minutes. I found that these 'check-in' and 'check-out' sessions, which the Creative Director or one of the design team leaders chaired, offered me an opportunity to consider on what was happening in the project, at a meta level. I also began to use this time to record how other participants in the project were reflecting on the project and to assess if my evolving opinions were corroborating with theirs.

3.6.3.2 Dealing with my dual role

The literature on participant observation notes that there are ethical issues to be considered when carrying out covert research (Jackson, 1983, Vinten, 1994). Therefore, I decided make my double role, as both a member of the DD:LL design team and as a person doing PhD research as explicit as possible. When somebody visited the DD:LL design studio, I always introduced myself as acting in this double role. This helped to remind all the other participants in the project that I was also carrying out research for my PhD.

3.6.3.3 Ensuring validity and reliability

I employed various methods of triangulation so as to improve the validity of the research. Firstly, I used data triangulation. I checked my primary research and initial findings, from having carried out participant observation/design research, against the DD:LL blog, which was updated approximately three times per week by the team leaders on the project, the individual blogs, which the members of the design team kept on a sporadic basis and the project compendium, a document produced by the team leaders and the Creative Director describing all DD:LL activities, projects and outcomes. Notes from informal interviews with the design team were also used for data triangulation purposes (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011b, Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a). Secondly, throughout the duration of DD:LL, I employed investigator triangulation, in that I checked my findings and observations against the other members of the design team. Thirdly, I employed methodological triangulation, in that I carried out a series of semi-structured interviews with high level DCC employees in order to understand
the medium term impact of DD:LL and how they viewed the initiative after having had time to reflect on it.

### 3.7 THE ANALYSIS OF THE CASE STUDY

With qualitative case study research, a definitive set of conventions for analysing data does not exist and various methods of analysis can be used. The three types of analysis, which I employed, are now explored.

#### 3.7.1 Analysis through reflection-in-action

The concept of reflective practice was conceived by Donald Schón as a way of describing how professionals go about their work. It was developed as a reaction to the notion of technical rationality, where theory and practice are viewed as distinct entities. Within the idea of technical rationality, theory is placed above practice and the researcher informs the practitioner about how procedures ought to be carried out. However, Schón points out that we carry out living largely based on unthinking actions, where all decisions are based on tacit knowledge. The classic example of this is the jazz musician who can improvise. He calls this kind of activity 'thinking on one’s feet' or ‘knowing-in-action’. The practitioner works using this principle and reflects-in-action, in that she reflects on her behaviour while it is occurring, seeking to achieve optimum results in the moment. Following this, reflection-on-action will occur, whereby the event is reviewed, analysed and evaluated before moving forward. This process is then repeated. The practitioner can thus be seen to carry out a series of sequential mini-experiments, to work towards developing a solution, while simultaneously developing a better understanding of the situation (Schón, 1983).

The act of designing can be seen as a form of reflective practice (Tan, 2012). The designer goes through a series of iterations of framing the situation or problem and then acting on it. So, the problem, or brief, and the proposed solution co-evolve. The design research that I carried out with Love the City can be viewed as a form of reflective practice. Therefore, this case study was analysed through being a design researcher, whereby I made sense of the project while being there and acting on it. An initial reading of DD:LL and their approach to collaborative city development was formed based on this reflexive practice.

#### 3.7.2 Analysis through constant comparison

The constant comparison method is the basic method of the interpretive inquirer (Thomas, 2010). This is where data collected is examined in an iterative manner. Initial themes, or temporary constructs, are captured. Then, the data is reassessed with these themes in mind, thus helping to hone them and create second-order constructs. In this research, I formed an initial reading of the case study based on the participant observation/design research and I identified a range of recurring themes through this reflective practice. Based on this preliminary understanding, I then assessed the other case study data and cross checked the initially identified recurring themes, noting corroborating and non-corroborating
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evidence. I used a 26 week timeline to organise the emergent reading, given that this was the duration of *Love the City*. Then, I produced a more refined reading of the case study and I carried out a final examination of the data before beginning to write up the results and produce the visualisation. I later found that through the process of writing and visualisation, I further developed and honed my findings.

### 3.7.3 Analysis through diagramming

Throughout the process of researching and analysing I used various visualisation techniques to develop my understanding of the case study. Samples of some of these diagrams and visualisations can be found in Appendix 7 and Appendix 8. It has been noted that visualisation can aid with a variety of cognitive functions such as externalising and communicating concepts, focusing attention, triggering memory, stimulating thinking and identifying structures, trends and relationships. Visualisations can also provide an overview of complex data sets (Platts and Tan, 2004, Gray and Malins, 2004). Diagramming techniques have been used to question and highlight how organisations work in reality (Mintzberg and Van der Heyden, 1999). Thus, through this visualization process, I was able to further develop my findings. Burkhard's framework for considering knowledge visualisation, which is reproduced in Table 3, aided this activity (Burkhard, 2005).

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function Type</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Recipient Type</th>
<th>Visualization Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Know-what</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Know-how</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Diagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>Know-where</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Know-who</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Visualisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - The knowledge visualisation framework as proposed by Burkhard.
```

Throughout this visualisation process, I was mindful that images are socially constructed and could potentially be misleading (Gray and Malins, 2004). Therefore, I tried to relate as much information as possible to an objective measurement, such as time (Tufte, 2006). The visualisation of *Love the City*, which was produced as a result of the in-depth study, can be found in Figure 50.

### 3.8 UNDERSTANDING THE MEDIUM TERM IMPACT OF DD:LL

I assessed the medium-term impact of the project through carrying out a series of semi-structured interviews, with high level DCC officials who had specific knowledge about the initiative. Therefore, the advantages, disadvantages and ethical issues associated with this method of data collection are also examined. I used industry ethnography, as described in Section 3.8.5, with which to triangulate the findings from these interviews.
3.8.1 Why carrying out follow-up interviews?

Approximately, two years after the completion of Love the City I carried out three semi-structured interviews with three different high level officials from DCC. The broad purpose of these interviews was to understand what the medium term impact of DD:LL had been on the city and on DCC. I also wanted to ascertain what aspects of the DD:LL approach were, in their opinion, promising. The specific interviewees included:

- John Tierney, City Manager, DCC
- Dick Gleeson, City Planner, DCC
- Ali Greehan, City Architect, DCC

These people were chosen for many reasons. They all had a broad overview of the city and of DCC, given their position in the organisation. Therefore, it was assumed that they would have insights into how DD:LL impacted upon both DCC and Dublin. John Tierney had supported the initiative since its inception in 2008 and had acted as the one of the dominant driving forces behind its implementation. Therefore, he had a vested interest in knowing about the various legacies of the project and it was assumed that he would have significant knowledge to impart in this regard. Ali Grehan and Dick Gleeson had been members of the DD:LL steering group on both the pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place and Love the City. Although there had been seven other members of the steering group, these two members had been particularly proactive and engaged. They displayed a keen interest in the project throughout all of the steering group meetings and had given generously of their knowledge and support. They were also very accommodating and helpful during the implementation of the prototype projects. Therefore, it was considered that they would also have much knowledge to impart about the impact of DD:LL. There had not, until this point, been any official querying of what the steering group had thought of the initiative. Therefore, I thought it would be critical to garner, through this research, their opinions on the matter.

3.8.2 The interview approach

I employed a semi-structured interview method. This is neither a closed questionnaire nor an open conversation. With semi-structured interviews a series of themes to be addressed is compiled. Then, a list of possible questions, based on these themes is formulated. The interviewer is not obliged to adhere strictly to this predetermined format. The approach allows for her to alter the order of the themes to be addressed and the format of the questions, depending on what happens at the time of the interview. This interview method was chosen because it gave some structure, but also allowed me to investigate points of interest further if they arose. There were five specific areas that were covered throughout this interview process. Firstly, I wanted to clarify how they had come to be involved in DD:LL and what they had seen to be the potential benefit of being involved in the initiative. Secondly, I wanted to ascertain if they considered DD:LL to have influenced the working culture within DCC and to know what working methods, if any, DCC had adopted from DD:LL. Thirdly, I wanted to determine if DD:LL had had any
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influence or impact on how city development is now undertaken. Fourthly, I wanted to seek their recommendations for carrying out a third iteration of DD:LL. Finally, I wanted to ascertain if there were any other legacies that I should be aware of.

Interviewing has been described as a craft that has to be cultivated (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2008). With this idea in mind, I carried out mock interviews before the real ones in order to hone my craft. There were some critical aspects of this method, as noted in the literature, that I was mindful of throughout the interview process. I was conscious of being seen to be listening attentively and encouraged the interviewees to talk through my use of positive and encouraging body language. I was aware of keeping the conversation focused on the purpose at hand and not letting it drift into unchartered territories. I was conscious to look for unusual terms which the interviewees might use, as they might help to reveal deeper feelings about the project. I was also looked out for strong intonations and I tried to repeat words back to the interviewee that appeared to be significant as a way of establishing what those words meant. I tried to interpret what the interviewees said, as the interview progress and then I verbalised these interpretations, as a way of confirming whether or not I had understood what they were saying correctly. Sometimes, I asked a question that paraphrased a previous question and, in that way, I gave myself an opportunity to gauge the reliability of the answer. I was careful to encourage the interviewees to talk about their specific experiences and not just to rehash general opinions. I was also conscious not to ask leading questions. I carefully considered the opening explanation and question, as I wanted to ease into the conversation and to give the interviewee a chance to get comfortable.

3.8.3 Interviewing and ethical issues

At the beginning of each interview, I explained to the interviewee the purpose of the interview. I pointed out that I was not interviewing them in an anonymous capacity, but rather in their official role as senior level employees at DCC. I then gave them a consent form to read and sign, see Appendix 4. The consent form highlighted the following:

- That the interview would be recorded using a digital dictation machine
- That I would transcribe the interview
- That the recording would be destroyed once the project was completed and the thesis written
- That the transcript of the interview would be forwarded to the interviewee for approval and could be updated or edited at their discretion
- That the final transcript would form an appendix to the thesis report
- That direct quotes from the interviews might be used in the thesis report and in academic journal papers or in academic conferences
- That all care would be taken to ensure that quotes or excerpts from the interviews reflect the intention and concerns of the interviewee
• That the recordings gathered during these interviews would not be released to any other party at any stage

It has been noted that, in general, the interviewer should be aware of the power differential, in any interview situation. However, when interviewing elites, this differential may be cancelled out because they are often in a secure position. It should be noted that by the time I undertook these interviews such a power differential was neutralised. I had already established a relationship with the interviewees through my involvement in Love the City and this proved to be beneficial as it helped me gain deeper responses from the interviewees.

### 3.8.4 Analysis of the semi-structured interviews

I transcribed these interviews and they can be found in Appendix 5. I incorporated the interview findings into Chapter 5, where the legacies of DD:LL are uncovered and Chapter 6, where Love the City is analysed and discussed. The transcriptions also serve as a record of how DD:LL was viewed by these officials. In analysing these interviews, I tried to look for invariant opinions and meanings that occurred across all three interviews. I also identified recurring themes, through using the constant comparison method. I also tried to analyse and make tentative conclusions throughout the interview process and to state these findings back to the interviewee for them to refute or confirm, which is a technique advised in the literature (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2008).

### 3.8.5 Industry ethnography: remaining active in the field

Tan has coined the term 'industry ethnography', as a way of describing a method of how 'deep hanging out' is done with members of a particular industry on a sporadic basis. In the two years following the completion of Love the City, I carried out industry ethnography with the DD:LL alumni. We had regular meetings where we discussed the legacies of the project. I also attended many follow-up meetings between high-level employees of DCC and the founders of D21C where they discussed the future moves of the initiative and the possibility of developing it into an MA in Professional Design Practice. (This master's was subsequently established in September 2012 and is described in Section 5.3.3.)

### 3.9 THE GENERALISATION QUESTION

This research focuses on a single case study and it offers an example of how the city of Dublin can be collaboratively developed in practice. Based on this research, I do not strive to establish categorical truths about how the city should or could be collaboratively developed in the future. Nor do I claim that such a project could ever be repeated. To do so would, in my opinion, be foolish. The project and its realisations were contingent on multiple social factors. Flyvbjerg has noted that there are no rules to govern the social world (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Therefore, no broad generalisations can be deduced from this research and I do not expect to be able to offer simple conclusions. However, this is not to suggest that there is no merit in carrying out this case study. Flyvbjerg has also noted that case studies are critical in
developing nuanced, detailed and advanced understanding of phenomena. He points out that a beginner's understanding is based on rules and theory, whereas an expert's knowledge is based on numerous and contextually differentiated case studies. Therefore, what this research offers is a thick description of DD:LL and how an attempt was made to collaboratively develop the city of Dublin. DD:LL presents a timely and highly relevant project. As was shown in Chapter 2, it can be located within an emerging field of design practice – design for social good. It is a very significant experiment in this field and it is therefore important to understand DD:LL's strengths and weaknesses so as to aid in the progression of the field. It offers a significant opportunity to experiment with a potential approach for collaboratively developing Dublin. Not to have examined it closely is a missed opportunity for the city as it could potentially inform future efforts to develop Dublin in a collaborative manner. Also, upon undertaking this research, I was aware of the potential within DD:LL, to create discrete methods for collaborative city development, through the advancement of urban prototyping. As is shown, in Chapter 6, Love the City contributed much to developing this method and to understanding its potential in terms of making effective use of resources. It is also envisaged that other cities and other design projects can derive their own inferences from the detailed description of the case study and the accompanying visualisation in Figure 50.

3.10 RESEARCH DISSEMINATION

As a way of soliciting feedback from a wide variety of perspectives, I presented this research in a variety of situations. It should be noted that in the case of lectures given, I always allowed for a generous question and answer session to follow the presentation so as to garner feedback from the audience. Therefore, I used the following opportunities to challenge my own reading of the research.

- Invited lecturer at University College Dublin, School of Architecture, Masters Program, lecture entitled 'Collaborative City Design', November 2012.

- Invited lecturer at University College Dublin, School of Architecture, Undergraduate Program, presentation entitled 'Participation in Architecture', October 2012.

- Invited speaker at 'City Intersections', an Arts and Humanities public discussion forum focusing on Dublin and its contemporary urban challenges, September 2012 (Lyes, 2012).

- Invited lecturer at The Dock, Carrick-on-Shannon which is the public art gallery in Co. Leitrim. The lecture was given as part of a festival entitled 'Inspirational Homes' and the author discussed using art installations as a way of engaging people in urban development, September 2012 (The Dock, 2012).
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• Invited speaker at the UCD symposium, entitled ‘Architecture and Society’ in March 2012.

• UCD/TCD ‘GreenShoots’ series of lectures on sustainable development, held in the Maxwell Theatre, TCD, January 2011.

• A conference paper was presented at the annual EURA (European Urban Research Association) conference in June 2010. The paper was entitled ‘100 Exciting Things you did not know about the City Centre’ and was based on the exhibition of the same title, which I developed with DD:LL as part of my research.

3.11 CONCLUSION

This chapter reiterated the aims and purpose of this research, as they guided the trajectory of this research. My epistemological and my theoretical position were then stated as these also helped inform the methodology. The main data collection method is framed as a hybrid of participant observation and design research. By viewing the data collection method as participant observation brings focus onto the idea of subjectivity and how to deal with it. It also highlights the concerns in viewing the human as the analyst, having deficiencies and biases as observers. Viewing the data collection method as design research helps to understand how I contributed to the development of the initiative itself and how taking a detached role during the working hours of the project might have been damaging to it. The hope is not to provide a theory, or a definitive model, but to learn something about this approach. In social affairs, we have only context-dependent knowledge and specific cases, such as Love the City, which is now described.
Figure 14 - Carrying out participant observation on/design research with Love the City.
4 THE CASE STUDY, LOVE THE CITY, DESCRIBED

‘However beautiful the strategy, you should occasionally look at the results.’
- Winston Churchill, former UK prime minister.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to give a clear and succinct description of Love the City. The goal is to impart an optimum amount of background information, so as to lay solid foundations for the discussion and analysis of DD:LL and their strategy for collaboratively revitalising Dublin, which is had in Chapter 6. Information previously given about Love the City is not repeated here. Therefore, for an introduction to the project and for an explanation of how it came to fruition, please reference Section 1.10. Also, for an explanation of how I gained access to the project, as a full-time, voluntary participant, please reference Section 3.5.1. The chapter begins with giving a brief overview of Love the City before describing each element of it in more detail. Following on from this, the geographical areas, on which the design process focused, are described. Then the brief, as set out by the Creative Director at the beginning of the project, is explained. The design studio from which the initiative operated is portrayed, before the various actors, who participated in the project, are noted. A chronological account of how the actual design process evolved is then given. The final prototypes, which were produced as a way of addressing the revitalisation of Dublin, are then briefly described. Other ancillary and important elements of the initiative are then noted. Descriptions of the significant and influential instances of conflict, which are analysed in Chapter 6, punctuate this account.

4.2 LOVE THE CITY - AN OVERVIEW

Wicked Problem: The deterioration of Dublin’s city centre
Aim: To revitalise the city centre
Strategy: A multi-disciplinary team consisting of local authority staff and volunteers were recruited to collaborate with the city authorities and citizens to examine the above wicked problem using a human-centred, design process. They were guided through this process by the Design Twentyfirst Century (D21C) Creative Director and team leaders. During the first stage of the project the entire city centre was examined. This allowed knowledge of the issue at a macro scale to be developed. During the second stage of the project, the focus was on the local scale and developing prototypical solutions to address the above wicked problem in this particular location, based on the ‘need’ as identified there.

Project Duration: 26 Weeks
Design Studio Location: Ormond Building, Ormond Quay, Dublin 1
Project administrators: The Creative Director (D21C employee), three team leaders (D21C employees)

Design Team: Seven unpaid volunteers and five seconded DCC staff (DCC employees)

Project Stages: Stage A: week 1-14,
Stage B: week 15-26.

Area under examination: Stage A: Dublin’s city centre
Stage B: The Markets Area, Dublin 1

Project Aims: Stage A: inspire people to become ‘re-aware of the city centre’s offerings’
Stage B: improve the urban realm by providing ‘experiences that are care-free, delightful, safe and about discovery’
Stage C: create a tool to communicate the findings of the project.

Significant Outputs: Stage A: ‘100 Exciting Things’ exhibition
Stage B: ‘Prototype Extravaganza’
Stage C: ‘The Compendium’. Due to Stage A and B running over schedule, this was not completed within the timescale of the project; it was therefore completed by the D21C staff outside the 26 weeks allocated for Love the city, in April and May 2011.

4.3 THE STUDY LOCATIONS

4.3.1 The Stage A study location

Love the City used a similar methodology as piloted in the first DD:LL project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place and as described in Section 1.7.1. However, the focus of Love the City was on a larger geographical location - ‘the city centre’. However, ‘the city centre’ is an ambivalent term and is open to various interpretations. After some consideration, it was decided that it roughly comprised the area bounded north/south by the Royal Canal and the Grand Canal and east/west by the East Link Toll Bridge and Heuston Station, as illustrated in Figure 15. This area is approximately 4 km in the north/south axis and 5km in the east/west axis. At the time, there were 130,455 people living in the this area, 156,730 people working in the area and approximately 50,000 students attending third level institutions in this area (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a).
4.3.2 The Stage B study location

At Stage B of the project, the design team focused their efforts on a smaller section of the city centre, which is referred to as 'The Markets Area'. This area is bounded on the south by the river Liffey, on the north, east and west by three busy streets, Bolton Street, Capel Street and Church Street. It is approximately 0.5 km east/west and 0.7 km north/south. The majority of the existing streets in the area were laid out in the 19th century, relative to the City Vegetable Wholesale Market and Fish Market, which was completed in the 1890's. The building is still used as a fruit and vegetable wholesalers and it is owned by DCC and is referred to as The DCC City Markets Building. Other significant historic buildings in the area include the Four Courts dating from 1796 and Green Street Courthouse dating from 1797. The rest of the built fabric in the area includes 18th and 19th century merchant houses and shops, some 20th century warehouses, apartment buildings and terraced housing, some of which are social housing and some of which are privately owned and some speculative office buildings. The area has a mix of small, winding cobbled streets and slightly larger vehicular streets. Historically, this area had been used as trading place for livestock, fish, flowers, fruit and vegetables. Currently, the area is still home to many flower, fruit and vegetable wholesalers. Some of these operate from privately owned warehouses and others operate from The DCC City Markets Building. The area also accommodates a large section of the legal community, with the Four Courts being located there. The entire place is characterised as being in poor physical condition, with roads and footpaths requiring resurfacing, an abundance of vacant properties and littered streets. It had been earmarked for redevelopment during the economic boom, with a €425 million regeneration scheme for the area having been developed (MBM Architects et al., 2006). However, this development was postponed, due to the economic recession (Coyne, 2010).
Collaboratively Designing Dublin

The Markets Area acted as a laboratory, in which to test out prototypical solutions for revitalising that particular part of the city. It was envisaged that the methods developed for revitalising this particular part of the city could then be applied in alternative locations. It should be noted that the DD:LL design studio was located within the study area, see Figure 15. This was a co-incidence and it had no explicit bearing on our choosing of this particular study location.

4.4 LOVE THE CITY - THE OUTLINE BRIEF

The brief for the project was created by the Creative Director in consultation with the steering group. A copy of this brief is given in Appendix 3. However, a brief summary of it is also given here, so as to allow the reader to orientate herself. It sets out three distinct phases for the design process. The first phase, Stage A, was entitled ‘Grow Awareness of the City Centre’ and it required the design team to focus on investigating and understanding the phenomena of decline in the city centre, at a macro level. The second stage, Stage B, was entitled ‘Improve the Destination Experience’ and it required the design team to focus on examining and revitalising a limited geographical area of the city. The intention was that the understanding of the phenomena of decline in the city centre, which was developed in Stage A, would, firstly, aid in guiding the choice of study area in Stage B, and secondly, help feed into and shape the choice of challenges, which would be addressed in that area. Therefore, the macro scale challenges would be addressed at a localised scale. This would be done through the creation of place- specific projects which would be prototyped in-situ. This endeavour to revitalise the localised area could then be seen as a prototype strategy demonstrating how the revitalisation of the entire city might be approached. The third stage, Stage C, was entitled ‘Make the City Sticky’ and it required the design team to create ‘a communication tool, like a book, that captures the work developed during the Love the City project and which proposes further test models for other areas of the city centre.’ (extract from Appendix 3). As already noted, the project ran over schedule and this stage was not completed within the 26 weeks allocated for Love the City. Each of the project’s three phases were delineated in the most general and open terms. The intention was that the exact content would be developed through the design process. In this way the brief was ‘...not a specification for a solution, but the starting point for an exploration’ (Cross, 2011, p. 14). All three stages were then further subdivided, outlining discrete research activities and describing the project deliverables. A brief summary of each of these sub-sections now follows.

4.4.1 The brief, ‘Stage A – Grow Awareness of the City Centre’

The brief, ‘Stage A1 – Introducing Dublin’ (week 1-3)

The planned activities of this stage were noted as follows:
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‘Through a multitude of conversations, presentations, research, photography and reflection, the team will absorb and reflect on Dublin’s character and playlist of activities, people and events until they reach their own individual and re-interpreted version of the city.’ (extract from Appendix 3)

The specified outcome of the design process at this stage was for each member of the design team to have compiled 100 examples of precedent projects and 100 sketch ideas for the project. The plan also noted that the design team would be tasked with creating a rapid prototype of one of these sketch ideas, over the period of one day.

The brief, ‘Stage A2 – Interconnecting Dublin’ (week 4-10)
The planned activities at this stage were set out as follows:

‘This phase will engage the team in a series of conversations, workshops, games, talks, etc., with a diverse range of stakeholders/users, aimed at further understanding why people are not travelling into the City Centre.’ (extract from Appendix 3)

The specified outcome of the design process at this stage was for the design team to have created and carried out 10 interview processes and to have extracted a broad range of insights about the phenomena under examination. At the end of this stage there was a design deliverable which was entitled ‘One Million Urban Offerings’. The broad outline of this deliverable was as follows:

‘Design a digital/physical space that acts like a market and offers a 360° perspective of everything that is happening in Dublin. The space should connect people, offer events, deals and insights, encourage new ideas, unite stakeholders, display the fresh and new and encourage people to rethink why they are not visiting the city centre’, extract from Appendix 3.

This would be showcased as part of Innovation Dublin, a weeklong festival, created by DCC, which celebrates and showcases innovation in the city.

The brief, ‘Stage A3 – Mapping Assets/Deficiencies’ (week 11-12)
The planned activities for this stage was to use information and insights gleaned from Stage A2, along with exploratory mapping techniques, to develop a way of identifying a localised geographical area of the city on which to focus on in Stage B. The particular deliverable of this stage of the design process was for the design team to have developed a mapping tool and in the process to have identified a localised working area for Stage B of the project.

The brief ‘Stage A4 – Open Studio’ (week 13)
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The planned activities for this stage of the project were to hold open studio days in the localised study area and also to showcase the work developed in Stage A as a way of engaging with the local community there.

4.4.2 The brief, 'Stage B – Improve the Destination Experience'

The brief 'Stage B1 – Zoom to Working Area' (week 15-16)
The planned activity for this stage of the project was to hold conversations and workshops with the users of the identified study area, to complete a detailed mapping of the working area and to create sketch ideas to aid its revitalisation.

The brief 'Stage B2 – Ideas Transformation' (week 17-22)
The planned activities for this stage of the project were for the design team to have developed and tested 10 projects which aimed to transform the local working area. At the end of this stage there was a larger deliverable, which was entitled 'Ten Expandable Ideas'. This was where hundreds of ideas, which were developed to help transform the working area, would be narrowed and synthesised into 10 design projects. Then each project would be developed and tested via full scale, live prototypes in the working area.

4.4.3 The brief, 'Stage C – Make the City Sticky'

The brief 'Stage C1 – 'Visual Blitz' (week 23-26)
The planned design activity for this stage was to create a means for communicating the work which was developed throughout the entire project. This means of communication would then be showcased in the working area. The project ran over schedule and this stage of the project was completed outside the 26 weeks which were scheduled for Love the City.

4.5 THE DESIGN STUDIOS

For the first two weeks of the design process, the project operated from a ground floor of a building in Temple Bar, Dublin 2, see Figure 16. It was an open plan, double height space and had large windows, which faced out onto the street. Therefore, all the activity happening as part of the project was clearly visible to the passerby.
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Figure 16 - The location from which the project operated for the first two weeks of the program.

For the remainder of the design process (weeks 3-26), the project operated from the second floor of a speculative office building on Ormond Quay, Dublin 1, see Figure 15 for exact location and Figure 17 for images. It was an open plan, single height space and measured 180 square meters approximately. DCC had had this vacant space in their possession and donated it to the initiative for the duration of the project.

Figure 17 - Internal view of office space where the project operated from (left) and external view of office block from the river Liffey (right).

Upon entering the space the Creative Director advised that the design team could arrange their working area in a formation that they considered to be optimum for the project. Therefore, we arranged the office desks so that each person faced each other, thus maximising the potential for interaction between each of the design team members. We decided that the desks would not be designated and that each person would occupy a different position each day, depending on what was available. The intention behind this decision was also to encourage interaction between all members of the design team. The Creative Director and the team leaders sat at the opposite end of the room, around a large, rectangular wooden table. At the centre of the room was an open space that was used for presentations, for 'check-in' and 'check out' (see section 4.7 for an explanation of these terms), and for various other group activities. A meeting table was also set up in the quietest corner of the room, furthest away from the design team.
Collaboratively Designing Dublin

Figure 18 - Layout of the office space converted into the DD:LL design studio.

The perimeter walls were lined with large rectangular sheets of white foam board, measuring 1 meter by 2 meters each, see Figure 17 for an image of this. The work in progress was pinned to these boards, thus making it continually visible. Completed work was supposed to be archived, as per the instructions in the Welcome Pack, see Appendix 1. The archived material was stored in plastic containers at one end of the room. An area in the centre of the room was set up to store stationary, materials and printing facilities.

4.6 ACTORS AND THEIR DESIGNATED ROLES

As well as the Creative Director, the design team leaders and the design team there were many other actors who gave input into the design process at different stages, helping to influence the projects trajectory and develop its content. The following section gives a brief description of these groups of actors and explanation of their designated roles in the project. A full list of participants can be found in Appendix 2.

4.6.1 The project administrators

4.6.1.1 The Creative Director

The Creative Director began working with the not-for-profit organisation, D21C, in 2008. She is a former student of the Institute without Boundaries, a former employee of Bruce Mau Design and a co-author of Massive Change (Mau et al., 2005). She has an undergraduate degree in architecture, professional experience working on multidisciplinary design projects and is a proponent of the concept of using design processes to address all ‘twenty-first century design challenges’ (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a). Her role on the project was to create the project program, to manage and oversee the project development, to guide and oversee the design process and to set out the design related activities. She was present in the design studio on a two week on, two week off basis. While she was not
always physically present, she oversaw the management of the project and set out the daily activities via daily video-conferencing meetings with the design team and the design team leaders.

4.6.1.2 The design team leaders

Each of the three design team leaders were also employees of D21C. They had volunteered on the pilot project, *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place* and were employees of D21C for the Discovery Phase. They were responsible for guiding the design process and the project when the Creative Director was not present. At these times, she gave them daily instructions for administering the design related tasks for that day. They were also responsible for project administration, IT management, the upkeep of the website, the maintenance of all *Love the City* social media activity, the graphic design of promotional material, administering and accounting for all financial transactions and writing the project blog. Their educational and employment backgrounds provided expertise in visual communication, branding, fashion design, multimedia design, product design and service design.

4.6.2 The design team

The role of the design team was to follow the design process as set out by the Creative Director and as administered by the design team leaders in her absence. The brief for the project was very broad; however, there were specific deadlines which the design team had to meet. There were 12 design team members in total, some of whom were seconded from their regular roles within DCC and some of whom were unwaged and volunteered on the project. I was one of these design team members, playing the dual role as an unwaged, full-time member of the design team and as a sponsored researcher. For the remainder of this manuscript, when I use the pronoun 'we' I am referring to the entire group of design team members, both the volunteers and the seconded DCC staff. Each of these groups of actors are now described in more detail.

4.6.2.1 The seconded DCC staff

These DCC employees were seconded from their regular posts within the organisation to work on the project in a full time capacity. They received their standard income for this time. This group consisted of employees from the public libraries department, the city architect's department, the public lighting services department and the community development department. Their collective educational and employment backgrounds provided the project with experience in anthropology, local government studies, business management, community development, youth work, architecture, architectural technology and sustainable development.

4.6.2.2 The volunteers

Six of the unwaged volunteers on the design team worked in a full-time capacity on the project and one member worked in a half-time capacity. As already mentioned, my role in the project was both as a

---

22 For the duration of this research, I received a stipend from TCD and from CTVR, the telecommunications research centre in Trinity College Dublin.
researcher and as a voluntary member of the design team. Therefore, I include myself within this subgroup. With the educational and employment backgrounds of this group, the project was provided expertise in industrial design, digital media, fine art, furniture design, electronic engineering, development studies, interior design, marketing, computer science, sustainable transport, behavioural change, sustainable development, urban design, architecture, multimedia communications and organic farming.

4.6.3 The steering group

The role of steering group was to help define the project as it progressed and to offer advice, guidance and information for the design process. This group consisted of nine high-level DCC staff, from a variety of departments, and the two founders of D21C. They visited the design studio on six occasions throughout the 26 weeks of *Love the City*, for approximately 1.5 hours on each occasion. On the first four of these occasions, the work in progress was presented to them by the design team and they then gave feedback based on this presentation. On some occasions they were asked for specific input, for instance with regard to identifying potential stakeholders for the scheduled conversations, as described in Section 4.9.2. At the second last steering group meeting, each member of the steering group was invited to partner with a particular prototype project and to help co-develop a strategy for its realisation. Therefore, in this instance they became collaborators rather than advisors. For example, I partnered with the City Planner and together we formulated a strategy for securing an exemption from planning permission for the erection of large scale posters in the public realm, as part of the City Works project.

4.6.4 The ‘Inspiring Speakers’

Throughout the project, 25 different people were invited to come into the design studio to speak about their work. For the most part these speakers were chosen by the Creative Director and the design team leaders. At later stages of the project, three of these speakers were chosen by members of the design team. The term ‘inspiring speakers,’ emerged over the course of the project, as a way of describing these invited speakers. In the first two weeks of the project, fourteen inspiring speakers were invited by the Creative Director to give presentations to the design team about their work and how it related to *Love the City*. Together, these presentations served as an initial catalyst for the design process, opening up a wide variety of perspectives on the city and its deterioration. It also served as a way to highlight a broad range of work which was already being done in the city and helped to build up ‘a network of friends of the project’ on which to draw upon at later stages of the design process. For instance, some of the speakers subsequently became collaborators on the final prototypes, partaking in their implementation.

---

23 The phrase ‘a network of friends of the project’ emerged over the course of the design process as a way to describe the network of people who had come in contact with the project, who had developed an understanding of its agenda, who were aware that it was a not-for-profit venture and who appeared to support it. Therefore, the design team felt comfortable calling on this network for additional help when required.
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e.g. Neill McCabe, fireman and creator of the first carbon neutral fire station in the world, subsequently became a participant in the City Works prototype.

4.6.5 The project advisors

Over the course of the project, four specialists were contracted by DD:LL to giving training and workshops. These workshops ranged from three hours to two days and their subject matter included designing and facilitating focus group interviews, using GIS software and using digital technologies in public spaces to enhance usability. Also, towards the end of the project, a specialist in neuro-linguistic programming facilitated three workshops with the design team, where the learning process, which was facilitated through DD:LL, was reflected upon.

4.6.6 The representatives from parallel projects

At the beginning of Stage A1, representatives from two DCC planning projects were invited by the Creative Director to give presentation to the design team about their work. Also, at the beginning of Stage B2, representatives from projects, which were aiming to regenerate The Markets Area in particular, were also invited to present their work. Both of these sets of actors provided information about the city and about the revitalisation work, which was already underway. According to the Creative Director, the intention of having them present their work was to open up opportunities for potential future collaborations. Such collaboration never materialised, but these contacts were also drawn on for help at the prototype realisation stage. For example, the DCC landscape architect, Peter Leonard, provided greenery for the Golden Path prototype as described in Section 4.9.5.

4.6.7 The random selection of city centre users

In Stage A2, the design team had conversations with approximately 1,000 city centre users. The team engaged with a random selection of people in various public spaces throughout the city centre. The intention with these exchanges was to entice a wide variety of people into discussion about the city centre and to gain some insights into the wicked problem under examination, the deterioration of the city centre. The Creative Director encouraged us to ‘feel out’ the situation through these conversations. She wanted us to get a ‘sense of’ why people were or were not coming into the city centre. A variety of spectacles were created in various areas of the city, in order to lure people into conversation, e.g. hundreds of blue ribbons were place on a busy pedestrian bridge, as described in Section 4.9.2.

In Stage B1 of the design process, the design team used a similar strategy to engage with city users in The Markets Area. Conversations about the current phenomena of decline in that particular part of the city were had with 270 people, as described in Section 4.9.4.

4.6.8 The targeted selection of city centre users

Throughout Stage A2, conversations were had with targeted groups of city stakeholders. These people were invited to give input about certain issues, which we considered were of particular relevance to the
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revitalisation of the city centre. These issues included movement in the city, enterprise in the city, making use of existing resources in the city and engendering a sense of ownership in the city. This particular process consisted of getting a group of stakeholders, with knowledge of a particular topic, to come together to debate and discuss the issue. In total, four sets of these conversations were had. Although 170 stakeholders were invited to partake in these scheduled conversations, only 35 people attended the gatherings.

4.6.9 The volunteer photographers

As the deadline for the first major deliverable, ‘One Million Urban Offerings’, grew closer and towards the end of Stage A2, there was not sufficient human resources amongst the DD:LL team to photograph all of the items for the Innovation Week Exhibition (see Section 4.9.2 for more details). Therefore, a request was put out, via the project network, looking for volunteers to help with the photographic work for the exhibition. Six people volunteered their photographic skills and equipment at this time, as a way of contributing to the exhibition.

4.6.10 The contracted architects

In week 10 of the design process and towards the end of Stage A2, a group of four architecture graduates were contracted by the Creative Director to create cardboard furniture for the Innovation Week Exhibition and the display of ‘One Million Urban Offerings’. They worked from the DD:LL design studio during this time, creating and building the furniture in the centre of the design studio.

4.6.11 The prototype realisation volunteers

Towards the end of Stage B2, much work had to be completed in a short period of time in order to realise the final prototypes. Help was required to meet the deadline. The design team leaders invited people, via the project website, via twitter, via the community centre, via the network of friends of the project and via the local colleges, to volunteer their time helping to construct and realise the prototypes. In total, 50 people volunteered. They acted as co-producers of the prototypes and not co-designers, in that the prototypes were largely already designed when they came on board. The largest co-production operation was associated with the Urban Living prototype, where a temporary woodwork shop was created in a vacant stall in the DCC City Markets Building, as described in Section 4.9.5. In this space, some of the DD:LL design team members and seventeen volunteers spent ten days constructing street furniture from recycled wooden pallets.

4.7 THE DAY-TO-DAY OPERATIONS OF THE PROJECT

The group worked full-time on the project, beginning at 9.00 a.m. and finishing at 5.00 p.m., having an hour break for lunch. The day began with ‘check-in’. This was where the Creative Director, the design team leaders and the design team had an orientation meeting while sitting in a circle in the centre of the working space. It was facilitated by the Creative Director or one of the design team leaders in her
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absence (see Figure 18). The team leaders and Creative Director arrived to work at 8.45 a.m. and always had seats arranged in this way before the rest the design team arrived. According to the Creative Director, sitting in this non-hierarchical arrangement was essential as it allowed everyone to see everyone else’s eyes and to communicate with each other directly. The initial few minutes of this meeting would be concerned with some informal conversation with each other, discussing a variety of items that were purported have some relevance to the project e.g. an article in the newspaper or a particular new initiative/film. Following on from this, the upcoming activities for the day would be discussed in relation to the project plan for the upcoming week and in turn in relation to the overall project plan. This check-in session tended to last approximately half an hour and all members of the design team were required to attend this event. However, for the majority of the time, only four out of the twelve design team members were present at 9.00 a.m., with the remainder of the design team arriving somewhere between 9.10 a.m. and 9.20 a.m. Therefore, for Stage B of the project, the Creative Director pushed back the starting time to 9.15 a.m. However, people then began to come in at approximately 9.30 a.m. Therefore, for the majority of the time, the check-in session happened without the full team being present. As previously mentioned the Creative Director worked from the design studio in Dublin on a two-week on, two-week off basis. When she was not able to physically attend these sessions, she spoke to the group in the morning via the internet. At the end of the day a ‘check-out’ discussion was also conducted, in a similar way to the check-in discussion. At this session, a review of what was learned throughout the day was carried out and the conversations were often guided to focus on how the design process or the design activities could be improved upon. This session was scheduled to begin at 4.45 p.m. and to last for fifteen minutes. However, it rarely began on time and often continued past 5.00 p.m.

The voluntary members of the design team were required to bring their own personal laptops to the design studio for the duration of the project. DCC provided their staff with new laptops with which to work. Wifi was supplied in the office space. Unfortunately, my laptop was unable to connect to it; therefore, I brought my own personal internet connection to the project. Each design team member had their own dedicated project email address and we were provided with 500 business cards at the beginning of the project. We were encouraged to give out these cards to any interested parties, throughout the course of the project. Each design team member also had their own specific blog role, where they were encouraged to record all thoughts and ideas about the project. There was also a team blog roll, which was updated by one of the design team leaders approximately three times per week. The most recent blog constituted the front page of the DD:LL website (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011b). Updates about the project were also communicated regularly via Twitter and Facebook.

Archiving was supposed to be completed at the end of each of the project stages, with all sketches, notes and photos, relating to a certain idea or theme being bundled together and subsequently stored in chronological order, in a box file. In addition, copies of all digital files were supposed to kept in an online
file sharing website. However, there was no standardised filing system stipulated. All photographs were kept in an online image storing account. The design related activities were photographed regularly by the design team leaders. However, both the archiving and filing of material was rarely completed as outlined above and, more often than not, was completed in a more haphazard manner.

At Stage B of the project, a book club was initiated by the Creative Director. Each member of the design team was given fifty euro to buy, read and review a book or books, which appeared to them to be particularly relevant to the development of *Love the City*. A book review was then given every second Friday in the design studio.

4.8 THE PROJECT ETHOS

Optimism and 'positive thinking' were integral to the DD:LL and their approach. This was highlighted in the project compendium. It notes that one of the four principles under which the initiative operates as follows:

‘Embrace an ethos of possibility and a ‘yes we can’ attitude. By approaching challenges creatively, with an open, optimistic and curious mindset we allow the space for sustainable innovation to occur’ (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a, p. 6).

This commitment to espousing an optimistic attitude is reflected in the particular language used in the DD:LL written material. For instance, the advertisement looking for participants to partake in *Love the City* noted that they were looking for ‘optimists, idea generators, boundless thinkers, explorers and doers to join a six month learning project based in the city centre’, see Figure 2. This positive tone was applied to every facet of the project. All emails sent, both among the design team and to external collaborators, made use of this tone. The output design material also used upbeat and positive language. For instance, the title of the innovation week exhibition was particularly upbeat: ‘100 exciting things you did not know about the city centre’. Similar language was employed for the title of the prototype launch day: ‘The Prototype Extravaganza’. Positive affirmations for the city such as ‘Yes to the Liffey’, ‘Love the City’ ‘Yes to the Northside’ and ‘Yes to the Southside’ were printed on thousands of badges and these were given out to people on the street. The Creative Director also promoted the use of positive phrasing when giving feedback to other members of the design team. For instance, the design team members were encouraged to give feedback using the following format: ‘What I like about your work and what you are doing is....... and what I would like to see more of is...’ In a conversation that I had with the Creative Director at the end of the project, I asked her about this consistent use of positive language in the project and she replied ‘That was influenced by me. It is based on my view of the world where there is no negativity, only love, optimism and opportunity. The DD:LL brand is built on optimism and on this truth.’ (Flood, 2011).
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Upon starting work on the project, each design team member received a welcome pack describing all the working logistics, such as information about their personal email accounts and their personal space on the project blog, see Appendix 1. It also described the working ethos, of the project, as follows:

'Respect is the single most important thing to remember when interacting with other team members. This can often mean letting go of your opinions, listening to others, absorbing what they have to say and gaining a fresh perspective. During the course of the project you will find yourself engaging with stakeholders and members of the public. Always engage with these people respectfully and again, be mindful of their time.'

A playful atmosphere was intentionally cultivated in the working culture in the design studio. The Creative Director and the team leaders often initiated impromptu games, such as musical chairs. In line with this intention, all of the design team member’s birthdays were celebrated with candle-lit birthday cakes, which were provided by the Creative Director and the team leaders.

Figure 19 - Love the City badges bearing positive affirmations.

4.9 A DESCRIPTION OF THE EVOLUTION OF LOVE THE CITY

The following section describes how the design process actually evolved over the course of the 26 weeks of the project. Exact details of the week by week activities of the project can be found in The Compendium and, therefore, an exhaustive description will not be repeated here (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a). Rather, the purpose of this section is to give a summary of how the project evolved, to give a flavour of the types of design related activities which were undertaken, to give a brief description of the design outcomes and to bring attention to significant and influential items, events and activities, which were omitted from The Compendium.
4.9.1 The evolution of Stage A1, ‘Introducing Dublin’

Stage A1 of the project was completed within the scheduled timeframe, from week 1-3. During this time the design team members considered and viewed the city from multiple perspectives, through listening to presentations from 14 ‘inspiring speakers’, see Section 4.6.4 for a description of these speakers. These people were invited by the Creative Director to present their work to the design team, as a way of catalysing the design process. The speakers were grouped under the following five themes: ‘Storytelling in Dublin’, ‘Entrepreneurship in Dublin’, ‘Society in Dublin’, ‘Interaction with Dublin’ and ‘Spirit of Dublin’. Each speaker was involved in undertaking actions to improve the city and they tackled a variety of social and environmental challenges. Many of them referred to themselves as ‘social entrepreneurs’ and claimed that their work had the dual purpose of making both a positive contribution to society and a financial return. They came from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds ranging from a medical doctor, who worked in drug-user rehabilitation, to an award winning film maker, whose work dealt with social issues in economically disadvantaged areas of the city.

Following on from each of these presentations, an extensive brainstorming session was initiated. Each design team member was tasked with individually producing 100 examples (20 per theme) of precedent projects that could serve as inspiration and a point of reference for Love the City. We were also tasked with generating 100 sketch ideas (20 per theme) to revitalise the city centre. The Creative Director advised us to defer our judgement while generating these ideas and encouraged us to ‘think outside the box’. Resultant ideas ranged from a call to bring back public soapboxes to a proposal to have a ‘positive protest’ outside the government buildings. See Figure 20 for a sample of brainstormed ideas. These 1200 ideas and examples were arranged on the perimeter walls of the working space, as a way of providing ongoing stimulation and fodder for the design process.
Each member of the design team presented what they considered to be their top 20 ideas to the rest of the group. Due to a limited amount of available time, it would not have been possible for all design team members to present all of their ideas. The design team, the Creative Director and the team leaders then voted on the most appealing idea under each theme. Each design team member then developed one of the ideas, which had received the most votes, as a prototype over a period of one day. For instance, under the theme of ‘Storytelling in Dublin’ the idea of having a ‘positive protest’ proved to be popular with the design team so it was developed as a prototype and enacted outside Dáil Éireann, the national parliament buildings in Dublin (see Figure 21). The results and findings of these rapid prototypes were then discussed within the group.

Figure 21 - The translation of one compelling idea into a prototype, over a period of eight hours. A ‘positive protest’ was staged outside of Dáil Éireann, the parliament buildings in Dublin.
4.9.2 The evolution of Stage A2, 'Interconnecting Dublin'

Stage A2 of the project was completed within the scheduled timeframe, i.e. from week 4-10. This stage was entitled 'Interconnecting Dublin'. The overall aim of this phase was to engage with a wide range of city stakeholders and users, with a view to developing an understanding of why the city centre was in a state of decline. A secondary aim of this engagement process was to collect insights and information for the key deliverable of this stage, 'One million urban offerings'. This deliverable would be showcased as part of Innovation Dublin, a much publicised, annual, week-long festival, which celebrates innovation in the city (Dublin City Council, 2012c).

This stage began with us carrying out a thorough review of the documentation of The Discovery Phase of the project. This documentation contained a broad range of information about the city and about the initial design research which was carried out into the phenomena of deterioration of the city centre (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2010). A brief description of its contents is given in Section 1.10. We analysed and discussed this work and its creators voluntarily came into the design studio to answer any questions about it.

In week 4 of the project we began to tease out the question concerning who we were hoping to revitalise the city for. The design team leaders requested us to create a matrix of city users. An extensive team brainstorming session ensued where we tried to identify all the possible users of the city. These were identified according to broad titles, e.g. the police man, the busker, the cyclist etc. This revealed hundreds of possible users, see Figure 23 for a sample of material produced from this brainstorming. We were then tasked with grouping these users according to different themes, as a way of making sense of this emergent information. This was the first week of the project when the Creative Director was not physically present. She was directing the team leaders from Copenhagen and she had asked them to administer this design activity in her absence. Without her physical presence, the activities in the design studio ran less smoothly and conflict within the design team, which impacted significantly on the design process, ensued. This conflict is now briefly described.
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Conflict 1 – Lost in the woods

The reason for carrying out the above task, of creating a matrix of city centre users, was not made explicit by the design team leaders. Also, the relationship of the task to the overall design agenda was not explained. One design team member became frustrated with this fact and questioned the relevance of this task. The design team leaders remarked that she shouldn’t worry about that at this stage and she should just ‘trust in the [design] process’. This questioning was seen, by the design team leaders, as being critical of their guidance. However, the design team member felt as through her concerns had not been listened to. Some friction in the group emerged as a result of this exchange. Some of the design team members were content to move forward, without a clear plan ‘feeling their way through the process’, while others wanted to know the exact logic and reason for completing each task. As mentioned in Section 2.3.2, the DD:LL design process was heavily influenced by Bruce Mau’s way of working and his approach relies heavily on the use of intuition and ‘feeling out’ of a situation as a way of making progress. This conflict, which centres around the way in which intuition was highly valued in DD:LL. This lack of using more scientific-based evidence for making progress will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

In week 5, the Creative Director tasked us with devising ways for extracting insights from these stakeholders. Two main methods were devised. We referred to them as ‘street conversations’ and ‘scheduled conversations’. The term ‘street conversation’ was used to describe the activity where we interviewed a random selection of city users in the public realm. The term ‘scheduled conversations’ was used to described the activity where we invited a specific user group to a specific place, with a view to discussing a specific topic, in which they had expertise. Therefore, these scheduled conversations were akin to focus groups.

Through the street conversations approximately 1000 city centre users and dwellers were engaged in discussions about what they considered to be the assets and deficiencies of the city and about what enticed and deterred them from visiting the city centre. Again, the Creative Director encouraged us to ‘feel out’ the situation through these conversations. Therefore, a definitive and co-ordinated set of
questions were not devised. Sometimes engagement was achieved using standard methods, such as handing out surveys and questionnaires. Other times, we employed more novel ways to engage people in conversation. For instance, using the existing public realm as inspiration and as a canvas, we created a series of playful and interactive installations to lure people into conversations. We created such an interactive visual spectacle by attaching hundreds of ribbons to the balustrades of a bridge on a busy thoroughfare. The project was introduced and explained through posters erected on the piers at each end of the bridge. Some members of the design team stood at each end of the bridge and invited passers-by to participate, by asking the intentionally open-ended question, 'What exciting secret do you know about the city centre that nobody else does?'

Interested passers-by were offered a waterproof marker and asked to write their answer on one of the ribbons tied to the bridge. They were then photographed, with their ribbon, subject to their permission. These photographs served as a record of who we had talked to and also, at a later stage, comprised visual material with which to advance the design. The question served as the opening to a conversation with the passers-by and discussion about challenges in the city centre sometimes ensued, depending on the individual's level of interest and their time availability.

On another occasion a space for interaction with passers-by was created, by constructing an outdoor living room on a busy thoroughfare. The intention was to present a tableau that did not obviously belong in this locale, arousing curiosity in the passerby. Again, posters were erected, introducing the project, and members of the design team were on hand, inviting interested passers-by to fill in one of the short questionnaires from the comfort of the sofa, in return for a cup of tea or coffee and a chance to sit on
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the couch. The initial questionnaire did not produce significant insights, so it was revised and the second iteration proved to be more fruitful.

Figure 25 - The ‘Chat Couch’ urban probe

Figure 26 - The initial questionnaire (left) and the revised questionnaire (right)

In total we carried out eight sets of street conversations in eight different locations, using a somewhat different approach each time. With each iteration, we tried to target an audience that had not already been engaged with.

Then, working in teams of two, and under the instruction of the Creative Director and two interview technique trainers, we designed six test interview processes for the ‘scheduled conversations’. These prototype interview processes were trialled on test groups and subsequently reviewed, before finalising
the approach adopted. The particular interview process, which we finally settled upon using, required the invitees to play a game where they asked questions to each other about the specific topic under discussion. This game aimed to stimulate debate and conversation amongst these targeted stakeholders. Two design team members hosted the game and two additional design team members were present to take notes about the activities and to photograph the proceedings. With the scheduled conversations various stakeholder groups were targeted, for instance the entrepreneurs in the city.

Figure 27 – One of the 'scheduled conversations'.

We discussed the findings from above research as it emerged. Sometimes a specific time was dedicated to the dissemination of findings, sometimes they were discussed at check-out sessions and at other times they were discussed in a more casual manner in the design studio. The aim of both the street conversations and the scheduled conversation was to gain a broad understanding about why the city was deteriorating. As already mentioned, we were encouraged by the design team leader and the Creative Director to ‘feel out’ the situation and to strive to gain some insights into what was encouraging and deterring people from using the city centre. Therefore, we did not formulate a definitive set of questions to ask. Also, a standardised way of recording the gleaned information was not agreed upon. The use of such an intuitive approach, lead to the second significant conflict in the project, which is now described.

Conflict 2 – Should inspiration be minable?

The design team member, who had a graduate degree in anthropology and experience in using qualitative interview methods, suggested that we find a more consistent and co-ordinated way of recording the findings from the street conversations. He was worried about the possibility of being unable to mine the data. His concerns stemmed from the fact that the questions, which were posed by the design team, were not standardised and also that a consistent means to record the garnered information was not employed. This information was rarely transcribed and was generally verbally relayed to other members of the design team. Therefore, the design team themselves became conduits for and the filters of this information. This opened up opportunities for the information to be misinterpreted. Accounting for personal biases was not
considered to be necessary by the Creative Director. However, there was a tacit assumption in the project that we did not have to be accurate and consistent in our recording methods because we were looking for insights or inspiration and not information. The concerned design team member argued that even if we were looking for insight and not information, asking consistent questions and accurately recording the findings in an unbiased manner was still necessary. He noted that insight is a subjective notion and what might appear as uninspiring information to one person might be fascinating to another. Although he had the most experience and knowledge of qualitative research methods in the group, his opinions on this matter were not valued over less qualified opinions. The Creative Director did not consult him about how to carry out this task. Instead of using his existing knowledge and expertise, a new method for garnering information from the passerby in public space was invented. The concerned design team member decided to leave the project. He was too unhappy with the quality of the qualitative research being carried out and he thought it was unjust to spend public money undertaking what he considered to be an illogical experiment. Therefore, in week 10 of *Love the City*, he returned to his regular role within DCC.

The emerging information helped to shape the key deliverable for this stage, 'One Million Urban Offerings'. After much consideration and debate about how this deliverable could be materialised, the Creative Director decided that an exhibition of 100 insights, which were gleaned from both the 'street conversations' and the 'scheduled conversations' would be created. The intention was that this exhibition would be used as a vehicle for collecting more insights and for initiating more conversations with the city's inhabitants. Therefore, it was viewed as a 'platform' from which to initiate the accumulation of 'One Million Urban Offerings'. The Creative Director produced the diagram in Figure 28 as a way of illustrating this strategy to the team.
The decision-making about which responses would comprise the top ‘100 Exciting Things’ progressed by way of lengthy discussion amongst the group. After an initial review of the accumulated insights, we concluded that some ‘exciting things’ were only seen to be ‘exciting’ if viewed from the respondent’s unique perspective. For instance, a teenager in the city said that his favourite place to spend time with his friends was at the extractor fans of a certain restaurant. The design team did not consider an extractor fan to be particularly interesting. However, the teenagers noted that this was a warm and sheltered spot where they could spend time, undisturbed by the police or shop security staff. When described from their point of view, the extractor fan became, what we considered to be, more compelling exhibition material. We wanted to present all of the ‘exciting things’ in this way. However, this was not a straightforward task. As mentioned in Section 4.9.2 the findings had not been recorded in a coherent manner and sometimes they had not been recorded at all. Therefore, we had to rely on memory as a way of partnering the insight with the corresponding story.

The exhibition opened on Wednesday the 18th of November 2010. On entering the gallery space, the visitors were given a map showing the locations of all the ‘exciting things’. Each physical location, around the city, was also tagged with a link to the exhibition. In the exhibition space, a winding path led the
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visitor through a maze of 100 cardboard boxes. Each box was covered with a range of photographs and a
description of one of the ‘exciting things’.

Figure 29 – The exhibition (left) and a tag at the location of the ‘exciting thing’ (right)

The following are examples of the ‘exciting things’ exhibited:

No. 12 - Dublin’s Light
A visitor to the city remarked that the light had particular and noteworthy qualities:
‘It is not a harsh light, it’s soft and has blurred boundaries. It adds a sense of mystery and magic and it is
perfect for interesting photography’.

No. 28 - The Monkeys Playing Pool on Kildare Street
A woman spoke about how she discovered this hidden gem.
‘I have walked down this street so many times and not once have I ever noticed these strange little
monkeys playing pool until it was pointed out to by a friend. They are fabulous! They’re on the pillars of
Cafe Des Amis, which is the red brick building on the corner of Kildare Street and Nassau Street. They
really add a sense of light heartedness to what would otherwise be quite a serious building’.

No. 96 - Park Bench at King’s Inns
In response to the request ‘Tell me about some interesting thing in Dublin’ somebody wrote on a blue
ribbon: ‘Bench in King’s Inns Park swallowed by a tree’.

Figure 30 - Three of the ‘exciting things’
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As already mentioned, the exhibition itself was used as a vehicle for initiating more conversations with the city's inhabitants and for garnering further information about what area of the city the project should focus on in Stage B. Exhibition attendees were invited to fill in a feedback form, in which they were asked:

- What amazing things in the city have we missed, that are special to you?
- How has the exhibition shaped your view of the city?
- What area in the city centre do you think needs more love and why?

The exhibition ran over four days and 350 people visited it. However, we had only 176 responses to the questionnaire. Recurring themes among the responses were that the exhibition:

- Revealed hidden secrets in the city.
- Offered a positive way of looking at the city.
- Served to connect people with similar views of the city.
- Encouraged people to explore the city further.
- Facilitated learning something new about the city.
- Several people noted that they liked the way that the exhibition highlighted different people's views and perspectives on what is positive about Dublin: that it is 'nice to see what we like'.

A Google Map displaying the locations and descriptions of the 'exciting things' was created and to date (30th September 2013) it has received 14,056 views (Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn, 2011).

Although the exhibition was well received by the public, assembling it was not without its difficulties and this task caused the following noteworthy dispute amongst the design team.

**Conflict 3 – Learning versus outcome**

The list of the top 100 'exciting things' was close to being finalised at 5.00pm on Friday the 12th of November, 5 days before the exhibition opening. The plan was to photograph these items from different angles and to cover 100 large cardboard boxes in these images. However, there was not sufficient time or resources to photograph everything. The Creative Director asked us if we would be available to work over the weekend. With limited notice offered and given our prior commitments, we declined. Therefore, four volunteer photographers were recruited for the task. On the Monday the 12th of November, at morning check-in, the Creative Director and the design team leaders informed us that they were disappointed that we were reluctant to work over the weekend. They also noted their concern over our apparent inability 'to grab this very important opportunity'. The volunteers on the design team felt aggrieved as they felt they had already given a lot of personal resources to the project. Tensions within the group mounted. However, the exhibition deadline loomed and therefore work had to continue. It was due to
open in two days time, therefore we worked long hours, into Monday and Tuesday night, finalising items and erecting the exhibition.

The tensions, which arose as a result of the earlier dispute, escalated. A negative atmosphere began to permeate the design team and the D21C staff. At the exhibition one of the design team members requested that we meet as a group to discuss the emerging issues. At this meeting she brought up what she construed to be the pertinent issues that were causing this negative mood. She felt that the design team lacked a sense of ownership of the exhibition. The graduate architects, who had been contracted to build the furniture, had not been introduced to the design team and we had not been told about their role on the project. Some design team members felt that they were doing the 'real design work', through the making and the crafting of the furniture. Other design team members noted their dismay at how the main concept, aesthetic and format of the project had been decided upon by the Creative Director. They had wanted to give input in that regard and felt that they had made a limited contribution to the exhibition. The discussion progressed and other design team members questioned whether the main goal of this project was to facilitate learning or to produce successful products. They noted, with respect to the exhibition, that they felt as though the focus was on producing 'outcomes' and that the success of the exhibition was of primary importance to the Creative Director. It was stated that if the project was about 'learning', there should have been an option to allow the exhibition to fail and to allow the design team deal with the consequences. This discussion was cut short by the Creative Director for unspecified reasons. She said that we would meet again as a group at the end of the week to discuss the matter further.

At this next meeting, we gathered in the circle in the centre of the design studio. The Creative Director announced that she was going to postpone the project for the duration of one week. She noted that she was tired of trying to instil a positive attitude into the team. She requested that we take this time to reflect on whether or not we wanted to be involved in the project and to return with a refreshed and more positive attitude. All of the remaining members of the design team returned to the project in week 12. A review of what we had reflected on was had and then the design process resumed as scheduled.

4.9.3 The evolution of Stage A3, 'Mapping Assets and Deficiencies'

Given the postponement of the project during week 11, Stage A3 was completed between weeks 12-14. This stage was entitled 'Mapping assets/deficiencies' and the aim was to identify a localised geographical area in which to work in Stages B1 and B2. It was intended that this choice would be informed by the findings from Stages A1 and A2 and through using geographical information systems (GIS) software. A GIS specialist came in to the design studio to give some tutorials on how to use GIS software. The plan
was that we would experiment with using this software as a way of helping to identify an area of the city in which to concentrate our efforts at Stage B. However, an exact approach for how this would be done had not been established and several issues subsequently arose. Firstly, we had no access to data sets. The Creative Director had assumed that this would not be an issue, given our close ties with DCC. However, the staff, in DCC, were not as forthcoming, with this data, as was expected. Also, nobody had any previous experience of using this software and the time frame, with which we had to learn it, was very tight. There were also difficulties with installing the software on the computers and many of the volunteers’ laptops did not have the capacity to run it. Furthermore, the findings from the previous stage of the project had not been investigated in a systematic manner, nor had they been recorded in a systematic manner. Therefore, it was difficult to build on them. Again, friction arose in the design studio and the following conflict resulted.

**Conflict 1a – Lost even deeper in the woods**

Although mapping the identified assets seemed like a straightforward idea, some members of the design team expressed their unease with trying to map deficiencies, noting ‘How is it possible to map what does not exist?’ The process at this stage appeared to be very unclear. Again, some members of the design team were content to ‘feel their way out’ of the ambiguity of the design process. While others wanted to solidify a reliable methodology for choosing a site. Frustrations were also expressed about the lack of consistent and coherent record of the findings from the earlier stage of the process. Therefore, after much discussion over the course of week 12, the Creative Director decided that we would have to change our approach. She instructed that each member of the design team would propose an area of the city in which to work. This proposal would be based on individual intuition, informed by the conversations had and insights gleaned from Stage A of the project. Each of the design team members and the design team leaders proposed an area of the city in which to work. There were many overlaps in the proposals and in the end there were only four areas to consider focusing our attention on. The various advantages and disadvantages of each of these four sites were discussed at length within the team. A summary of this discussion was presented to the City Planner and the Assistant City Manager and they made the final decision about the site choice.

The Markets Area, in the north inner city, was chosen and it is described in Section 4.3.2. It was selected for a combination of reasons. It is on the edge of the busy, commercial heart of the north inner city, the Henry Street area. Yet, it receives very little pedestrian traffic and is unknown to many people. It has some important but undervalued and largely unknown historical buildings, e.g. St. Mary’s Abbey dating from 1190 and Green Street courthouse dating from 1797. There are many atmospheric small cobbled laneways and two attractive and newly restored small parks. Although there is very little activity in the area in the late afternoon and evening time, in the morning it is a very lively place with wholesalers coming and going. There is also an abundance of vacant buildings in the area. Therefore, we concluded
that this area had many issues to be solved and, at the same time, it also that it had plenty of underutilised and undervalued assets which could be used as part of the revitalisation process. Also, since the earlier mentioned €425 million regeneration scheme for the area was put on hold in 2008, the area had been in a state of limbo. Therefore, we hoped that through our work in this area we would be able to suggest to DCC an alternative, more economical way of revitalisation this part of the city.

Stage A4 of the project was not completed due to Stage A3 running over schedule. Therefore, Stage A3 was completed just prior to the Christmas holidays.

4.9.4 The evolution of Stage B1, ‘Zoom to Working Area’

Stage B1 of the project was not completed within the scheduled timeframe, i.e. in weeks 15 and 16. It ran over schedule by one week. The overall aim of this stage was to develop a detailed understanding of The Markets Area. However, firstly, we reviewed and discussed what we had already learned about the overall phenomenon under investigation, the decline in the city centre. We wanted the understanding, which we had developed, to shape how we addressed the decline in this particular area. So, as a way of consolidating what was learned at Stage A, we grouped the garnered insights, about the challenges facing the city centre, under various themes. We then rated these themes according to their perceived importance. They comprised:

- Identity, communication and ownership
- Environment
- Moving about
- Safety and street hassles
- Expense

Again, this exercise necessitated having lengthy discussions. With these themes in mind we reviewed the 1200 sketch ideas, which were generated at Stage A1 of the project, aiming to identify ones which could address the city wide challenges. Then as a group, we then took a tour around the Markets Area, with a selection of these original ideas in hand, noting existing locations where they might be applicable and existing assets that might help us realise them.

Following on from this, each member of the design team carried out a detailed study of the area, with each person focusing on a specific aspect of it, such as the history of the area, how the buildings were being used and how the public domain was being used. Existing and proposed plans for the area were also reviewed. We also interviewed 270 people as a way of garnering insights that would help progress our understanding of the area and inform the design process. Again, we used ‘street conversations’ for
that purpose. This time we set up cardboard tables in different locations in the area, which had a large sign explaining the project to passersby. We offered fruit in exchange for conversation.

![Figure 31 - 'Street conversation' in the Markets Area (left) and sample of one part of the site study (right).](image)

We also spent time observing the area and how it changed over the course of the day. It was a hive of activity in the early morning, with goods travelling to and from the markets. By late afternoon, it was much quieter with a limited number of people passing through and at night the dimly lit streets were deserted.

![Figure 32 - The Markets Area: poorly maintained street surface and narrow footpath (left), social housing (middle), market activity (right).](image)

4.9.5 The evolution of Stage B2, 'Ideas Transformation'

Stage B2 of the project also ran over schedule. The Creative Director decided that the original 26 week schedule was too ambitious and Stage C would not be completed within this timeframe. Instead it would be completed after the 26 weeks, by the Creative Director and the design team leaders. Therefore, Stage B2 now had more time to be developed. The aim of this phase of the project was to enact 10 prototypes of projects, all of which aimed to improve The Markets Area. This was the second key deliverable of the project and it was entitled 'Ten Expandable Ideas'.

The findings of the 'street conversations', which were held in the Markets Area, were reviewed and the various challenges facing the area and its vitality were examined. Each member of the design team then chose a particular challenge that they wanted to investigate, analyse and dissect. These challenges comprised:

- Lack of a knowing how the public services in the area worked
- Lack of ease to start a new business
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- Lack of fun and lightness
- Lack of vibrancy and diversity
- Lack of a sense of ownership
- Lack of facilities
- Lack of ease of navigation
- Lack of a sense of safety
- Lack of identity
- Lack of communication between people

Each member of the design team chose to address one of the above challenges, using their own particular approach and, from week 18 onwards, we each developed projects to address these challenges. At the end of this stage eight prototype projects were developed. Brief descriptions of each of these projects now follow.

Figure 33 - Map of location of prototype projects.

Prototype No. 1 - 10 Enterprises/10 Days/10 Tests
This project addressed the theme of a lack of ease to start a new business in the area. It investigated how the city could leverage socially conscious businesses as a way of transforming declining areas of the city. Firstly, research investigating what type of social enterprises had potential to be successful in The Markets Area was carried out. Proposals for 10 different types of social enterprises, which utilised the assets of the area, were created. Following on from this, a ‘Laboratory of Transformational Enterprise’ was created, in a vacant warehouse in the area, which showcased each of the proposals. Workshops that aimed to develop these projects were held in the laboratory. Interested parties were invited to take
ownership of and develop the proposals. However, despite the fact that the project received much interest, nobody took ownership of any of them.

Figure 34 - The 'Laboratory of Transformational Enterprise' project.

**Prototype No. 2 - Microcosmic Intervention**

This project addressed the lack of a sense of ownership in the area and the prototype sought to encourage residents in the area to take more ownership of the surrounding public realm, which was quite dilapidated. Various attempts were made to encourage people to take care of a small piece of common space outside their own front door. For instance, workshops aimed at precinct improvement were held and residents from the area were invited to attend, but nobody showed up. Therefore, a small demonstration project was enacted, whereby a neglected area in the car park of a social housing project was converted into a temporary seating area, complete with planting and public art. The hope was that people would see how attainable it was to improve the public realm and this would encourage further efforts to improve the area. There is no evidence to suggest that the project had this effect.

Figure 35 - Before and after images from 'Microcosmic Intervention' prototype.

**Prototype No. 3 - City Works**

This is the project which I developed from week 18-26. Broadly speaking, the project aimed to increase understanding and empathy between all stakeholders in the area. It was found, through the 'street conversations', that the relationship between the service providers in the area and the people who regularly used the area was very poor. The users felt that they were not being taken care of by the service providers, particularly the local authority and, therefore, they resented them for that. This resentment resulted in the widespread disrespect of the public realm by the users, which was seen to be the property of the service provider. As a way of addressing this issue, the people whose everyday work
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allows the city to function, people such as the postman, the garbage collector and the parish priest, were showcased around the area and celebrated via large scale posters. Also, a temporary people library was created, whereby citizens could choose to borrow one of these service providers and get to know about how their work contributes to making the city function. It was intended that the long-term custodian for the project would be DCC and that they might want to continue to run the project, as a way of helping to improve their relationship with the traders and residents in the area. However, despite the positive reaction to the project, it has not been further developed.

Figure 36 - The 'City Works' prototype: human library (right) and giant promotional poster (left).

Prototype No. 4 - Golden Path

This project addressed the theme of a lack of a sense of safety and the lack of ease of navigation in the area. It sought to make navigation through the area more legible and safe. At present, the footpaths there are very narrow. This project originally sought to temporarily pedestrianise the route from the busy shopping street nearby, Henry Street, to the entrance of The DCC Markets Building. However, due to difficulties in gaining permission for the prototype, the project was scaled back. In the realised prototype a part of the street was reclaimed for pedestrian use by temporarily widening the footpath. It was well received by all the users, the traders and DCC. The design team helped form a lobby group to pursue its permanent installation, yet no further progress has been made with the project. During the realisation of this prototype, a noteworthy conflict occurred and it is now described.

Conflict 3a – Learning versus Outcome Round 2

As already mentioned, the two design team members who were leading this project were experiencing difficulties with regard to gaining permission to temporarily pedestrianise the street. After two meetings with the DCC Roads and Traffic Department and several other phone calls to them, they were granted permission to widen the footpath for one day. This necessitated the removal of the car parking spaces on the street. However, the traffic was still able to pass. Therefore, crash barriers had to be installed along the widened pedestrian route. DD:LL had to pay DCC €7000 to have these parking spaces removed and the crash barriers installed for one day. The realisation of this prototype was logistically cumbersome. The day
prior to the Prototype Extravaganza much work remained to be done. The Creative Director stepped in and began working on its realisation. The project leaders felt that the ownership of the project had been taken off them and that they had lost control over the project. One of the project leaders commented:

‘The last few days of the project were very frustrating. I would have liked the outcome to have been a true reflection of our learning and not of Designing Dublin. I had wanted to take ownership of it and felt that the ownership was taken off me.’

Figure 37 - The ‘Golden Path’ prototype.

Prototype No. 5 - Pimp Your Pavement

This project addressed the theme of a lack of communication between people in the area. It aimed to create more opportunities for interaction between people in the area, while simultaneously improving the public realm. A co-design workshop that aimed to recruit partners to plant wild flowers in public space was held. However, nobody attended it. It was then decided to convert a neglected, desolate public space, at the base of an abandoned building, into an area that would encourage interaction between city users. The entrance steps to the building were transformed into a pop-up park with the aid of volunteers from the area. Passers-by were invited to interact with the park and shape it. This prototype served as a demonstration of what could be done with this piece of land on a more long term basis. A long term custodian of the project was not secured.
Prototype No. 6 - Broadcasting People

This project addressed the theme of a lack of sense of identity in the area. It investigated how to help strengthen the identity of the Markets Area and how to use this strengthened identity to encourage more people to visit the place. Videos depicting people who live in and work in the Markets Area describing why they are fond of the place were recorded. These videos were showcased in different public venues around the city for a period of one week. It was intended to be a demonstration project for DCC presenting them with a new way to strengthen and communicate an area’s identity. There is no evidence to suggest that they have ever repeated this strategy.

Prototype No. 7 - Urban Living

This project addressed the theme of a lack of vibrancy and diversity in the area. It investigated ways to improve the comfort and diversity of the public realm, within a very limited budget and employing existing, underutilised assets. Seventeen volunteers from around the city and from the area were recruited to construct much needed street furniture for the area. These were made out of recycled pallets found littering the streets. Some of the empty stalls in The DCC City Markets Building were used as a base and a workshop in which to create this furniture. The colourful street furniture was then used to enliven the new public space that was created in the Golden Path prototype.
Prototype No. 8 - Creativity Network

This project addressed the theme of a lack of fun and lightness in the area. It aimed to create synergies between creative people from the area and provide a platform for them to co-create projects together. Various interested parties were invited to workshops to help develop this 'creativity network'. A long term custodian for the project was identified. Since the cessation of DD:LL, this network has met up on one more occasion. However, the 'creativity network' has not grown any further than this.

4.9.6 Stage C1

Stage C1 of Love the City was entitled 'Visual Blitz'. The original aim of this stage was to record the work that was developed over the course of the project and to compile it into a communication tool so that similar projects could be carried out elsewhere in the city. However, as already mentioned due to Stage B requiring more time than was expected, Stage C was completed by the design team leaders outside the 26 weeks scheduled for Love the City. It resulted in the production of The Compendium, a document that compiles information about the entire DD:LL experience. It describes the activities undertaken, methods used and outcomes of all the D21C projects that were undertaken between 2009 and 2011 (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a).

4.10 ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES

In addition to the main bulk of the design work, which was described in Section 4.9, there were some ancillary activities carried out, which are important to take note of.
4.10.1 ‘Love the City Out Loud!’
Outside of the 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. working hours of the project, there was further opportunity for volunteers to get involved in revitalising the city through the conduit of ‘Love the City – Out Loud’. This was a working group of people with an interest in making some improvement to the city. They met every Wednesday evening for an hour and a half. One of the design team leaders helped them to develop prototypes of revitalisation projects. These volunteers were given the opportunity to apply for some start-up funding for these projects. This funding was allocated as part of the DD:LL budget. Over the course of the project they developed five projects and prototyped them in the public realm. For instance, a series of swings were created and tested along the banks of a canal.

4.10.2 The DD:LL radio show
A local-radio DJ approached the Creative Director with a proposal to make a series of shows about Love the City. She agreed to the proposal and eleven live shows were broadcast, all of which helped to raise awareness about the project. (Near FM, 2011)

4.10.3 The DD:LL documentary
In February 2011, a documentary film maker approached the Creative Director and presented an idea about making a film about the initiative. She agreed to this proposal and he devoted significant time to filming the various happenings on Love the City. He also gave considerable assistance to the design team, helping them implement some of the prototypes. He is still in the process of making the documentary.

4.11 CONCLUSION
Love the City had many different facets. The most significant elements of the project are outlined above. This thick description provides necessary information to understand the initiative, prior to the discussion and analysis of it, in Chapter 6. However, firstly, the legacies of the project are uncovered as they also inform the analysis.
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Figure 42 - The Studio, DCC's in-house innovation lab.
5 UNCOVERING AND MAPPING THE LEGACIES OF DD:LL

'I suppose this was a very different journey to embark upon for a public sector organisation, but one which has been very worthwhile. And we do have a basis for this to become a very strong part of the organisation, through the work of The Studio in particular, within the city council. And I think, for me, the learning that the people got, the potential to make use of that learning, now through The Studio and its potential to have an influence on the city council and therefore the city, offers a path forward.'


5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present the legacies of DD:LL, which were uncovered two years after the cessation of Love the City. In the context of this chapter, the term legacy is used to describe anything that has been passed on from a predecessor and in this case the predecessor is DD:LL. The first group of legacies discovered were the various initiatives that DD:LL spawned. The second group of legacies, which were uncovered, were those that resulted directly from the work that the DD:LL design team carried out in the city. For instance, it was revealed that some of the prototype projects, which aimed to revitalise various parts of the city, continued to grow after the cessation of DD:LL. The third group of legacies, which were uncovered, were the various ways in which DD:LL effected or influenced the culture of working and the working methods in DCC. The methodology employed, for this part of the research, is briefly reviwpred before the content of each of these three groups of legacies is described in detail.

5.2 METHODOLOGY

The information, which informed this chapter, was gleaned from having continuously carried out industry ethnography, post completion of my involvement in Love the City as a participant observer/design researcher. The term 'industry ethnography' is explained in detail in Section 3.8.5. However, I would just like to briefly recap on what it means in the context of this chapter where the legacies are uncovered. The term is used to describe how, from April 2011 until May 2013, I spent time with the DD:LL alumni discussing the initiative and the various emerging ways in which it was impacting upon the city and DCC. For instance, I attended regular reunion meetings with the design team. I also spent time with Peter Leonard who was a member of the pilot project design team, an executive landscape architect in the DCC Parks and Landscape Service Division and the project architect who designed and oversaw the temporary works on Fade Street and Clarendon Street/Clarendon Row. Both of these projects are discussed in detail in Section 5.5.2.2. The term ‘industry ethnography’ also describes the activity of my attending various meetings and events, which aimed to build on the work of DD:LL. For instance, I attended various meetings where D21C, DCC, Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT)
and the Institute without Boundaries met to discuss and progress the idea of 'the Dublin Project'. Further details about this project are given in Section 5.3.3.

Information about the legacies of DD:LL was also gleaned from having carried out a series of follow-up, semi-structured interviews with two members of the DD:LL steering group, the City Architect and the City Planner, and also with the City Manager. Semi-structured interviewing, as a research method, is discussed in Section 3.8.2 and 3.8.3. The justification for choosing these particular interviewees is discussed in detail in Section 3.8.1. Transcripts of all of these follow-up interviews can be found in Appendix 5.

The categorisation of the legacies into three strands emerged from having analysed the interview transcripts using the constant comparison method and having triangulated these findings with what was uncovered through having undertaken industry ethnography.

### 5.3 INITIATIVES WHICH DD:LL SPAWNED

As a result of having completed DD:LL some other initiatives, which built on it emerged. These are described in the following Section with reference to how they relate to DD:LL.

#### 5.3.1 The Studio

In the summer of 2010, on foot of having completed the pilot project, John Tierney, the City Manager, established an innovation lab in DCC, called The Studio. In an interview with him he noted:

> 'we now have The Studio set up, which grew organically out of the project, well the two projects [the pilot project and Love the City]. And that for me was always my aim to try and embed it within the organisation on a gradual basis.' (Tierney, 2013)

The Studio's mission statement is as follows:

> 'Our aim is to grow the DCC's capacity to innovate and improve the quality of our services. We do this by bringing people together to test new ideas and prototype new ways of working.' (Dublin City Council, 2013)

Three of the seconded DCC staff members, who partook in the pilot project as design team members, did not return to their previous roles within the organisation. Rather, they began working in The Studio. They helped to set it up and have developed projects to progress the above mission statement. Also, upon the completion of Love the City, two of the seconded DCC staff members who partook in the project as members of the design team also joined The Studio.
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There are four main areas or projects that The Studio focuses on. The first of these is the staff ideas scheme. This is where all DCC staff are invited to propose an idea for improving how DCC delivers its services. The Studio staff help to develop the winning ideas, in collaboration with the proposer. According to the DCC website, these projects result in ‘cost saving and efficiencies to the council and the city’ (Dublin City Council, 2013). The second project, which The Studio has also established, is entitled ‘Dublinked’. It brings the four local authorities in Dublin together with the National University of Ireland, Maynooth (NUIM) and IBM’s Smarter City Research Lab. The purpose of this project is to make previously restricted DCC datasets open source. Thirdly, The Studio has developed a general strategy and toolkit, which aims to improve the design of DCC’s city services using a user-centric approach\(^\text{24}\). This toolkit and strategy was created in collaboration with Una McGrath, a former volunteer on the Love the City design team (McGrath, 2012). Fourthly, The Studio now facilitates the public consultation processes for various DCC projects through the use of street conversations (The Studio, 2012). This particular approach to public consultation was developed by members of the Love the City design team, when they were contracted by DCC to carry out the public consultation for the Grafton Street Quarter, see Section 5.5.1. In addition to these four main areas of focus, The Studio also facilitates the collaboration between DCC, the Institute without Boundaries and DIT on The Dublin Project, see Section 5.3.3.

5.3.2 Beta Projects

The seven DCC staff, who partook in DD:LL and subsequently did not join The Studio, returned to their regular roles within the organisation. The intention was that they would apply their newly acquired skills and ideas to help develop, inform and innovate in their day-to-day work. However, some of these staff members used the experience acquired through their involvement in the project to a greater extent than others. For instance, one of the members of the Love the City design team, Shane Warring, continues to attempt to revitalise the Markets Area, using his allotted 10% innovation time\(^\text{25}\). The Markets Area was the area of the city on which Love the City focused at the later stages of the project. The strategy, which he employs in his endeavours, builds on the open, collaborative model that was tested in DD:LL. He has created a web platform, entitled Beta Projects, which aims to allow people to partake in improving the city. It is being developed in an iterative manner and the first iteration went live in March 2012 (Warring, 2013). Through this platform he seeks to encourage people to suggest ideas for improving the city. These ideas are then weighted according to a particular set of criteria, which prioritises projects that align with the 25/30 year vision for Dublin, as set out in the current city development plan and as described in Section 1.5. The most appropriate ideas are then trialled on a short term, hands-on, low budget basis, in the public realm. The proposer is invited to partake in the trialling of the idea and the

\[^{24}\] It is envisaged that this toolkit can be applied to all DCC's 550 city services.

\[^{25}\] In this particular DCC department, the staff are allowed to dedicate 10% of their working time towards some particular innovation in the organisation.
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public are invited to evaluate it. Therefore, the entire process attempts to operate in a fully transparent manner with all documentation of the process being made available on the website.

Figure 43 - Beta Projects on street advertisement requesting to feedback to trialled projects (Beekmans, 2013).

The first ‘beta project’ that was carried out was entitled ‘Traffic Box Art’. This project was used as a way of testing and developing the Beta Projects development model. In this project, the opportunity was offered for people to propose an art piece, which would be displayed on one of the eleven traffic boxes in the Markets Area. A public evaluation process, of the proposals, ensued and the most popular options were tried out over a designated period of time. The public were invited to comment on the trialled artwork via the web-platform.

Figure 44 - Example of a ‘beta project’, Traffic Box Art

Traffic boxes are metal boxes measuring 800x1400x400mm approximately and are located on footpaths. They house traffic control hardware.
5.3.3 The Masters in Design Practice at DIT

A third iteration of Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn never materialised. The City Manager noted that this was due to a lack of financial resources (Tierney, 2013). However, D21C, in conjunction with DCC and Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT), have built on the DD:LL model for collaborative city development by establishing a post-graduate Masters in Design Practice, which uses a similar approach to city development as DD:LL. Students are offered the opportunity to work, as a group, on a multidisciplinary project entitled The Dublin Project. The goal of the project is to make a positive contribution to Dublin through working with DCC and using ‘live data’ to generate the work. The programmes promotional material notes that:

‘The objective of this programme is to leverage the combined talents of the Masters students, DIT academics, City officials and industry experts. The course will provide real-time experience to the Masters students to collaborate with DCC in enhancing the City’s diverse operations and how citizens experience them.’ (DIT, 2012).

D21C also facilitated the linking of this Masters in Design Practice with the Institute without Boundaries in Toronto, Canada. As noted in Section 2.3.1, the Institute without Boundaries was created by Bruce Mau in collaboration with George Brown College, Toronto and it offers a one-year post graduate program in applying design thinking processes to contemporary wicked problems. Their website states:

‘This programme will prepare a new breed of designer, who in the words of Buckminster Fuller “is an emerging synthesis of artist, mechanic, inventor, objective economist and evolutionary strategist” equipped to create innovative local solutions to 21st century global challenges.’ (The Institute without Boundaries, 2013)

Each year the programme addresses a different wicked problem. In the summer of 2011, it came to the attention of D21C that the wicked problem that the Institute without Boundaries were hoping to address, in the upcoming academic year, was the redesign of city services to meet contemporary demands. D21C offered to link their postgraduate program with DCC and with the embryonic Masters in Design Practice. They saw an opportunity for the DIT staff to learn from the experiences of the Institute without Boundaries, given that the Institute without Boundaries had been running a similar postgraduate design program since 2004. D21C helped establish the relationship between the Institute without Boundaries and DCC, a relationship, which proved to be a fruitful one. As a result of this meeting, the current Institute without Boundaries program is focusing on reengineering the services of

---

27 I became aware of this fact while attending the Sustainable Design Summer School, hosted by the Recentre, a sustainable research centre and the IwB in Belgium in the summer of 2011. Six Irish people, all of whom had been involved in DD:LL attended this summer school. I attended this summer school in order to increase my understanding of the terrain I was studying. This is another example of my carrying out ‘industry ethnography’.

28 It should be noted that Vannesa Ahuactzin, the Creative Director of D21C was a graduate of the first IwB program, a fact that was discussed in section 2.2.1.
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Dublin and they work in tandem with DIT on The Dublin Project. The Studio facilitates the linking of both programs with DCC.

Therefore, DD:LL can be said to have become institutionalised through these two post-graduate courses. This has given the concept quite a stable framework from which to work. This fact was noted by the City Manager:

'So we didn’t do a Designing Dublin 3.0, but we are into another phase of trying to use the principles of that now, within a framework developed between the city council, the IwB [Institute without Boundaries] and DIT.' (Tierney, 2013)

5.3.4 The Civic Works

In 2012, one of the participants on Love the City, Tara Wheelan, partnered with one of the Love the City inspiring speakers, Ré Dubhaigh, an experienced service designer, and together they set up a design company called The Civic Works. They first met through Love the City. The Civic Works is a service design company that creates new services and tools to make 'measurably better' public goods. They work in an 'open and collaborative' manner using 'assets and resources at hand.' (Dubhaigh and Wheelan, 2012)

5.3.5 d.ploy

In 2011, two of the participants on pilot project, who first met through the initiative, set up a cultural organisation called d.ploy. Their mission is 'to unlock economic and social innovation by supporting the creative and cultural industries'. They claim to do this by working with a variety of different actors and by researching, developing and disseminating 'innovative solutions for living, working and sustaining creativity in an urban environment'. For instance, they have created a working and exhibition space in a formally derelict warehouse in the city centre. They use the exhibition space to showcase both their own work and the work of others. They also live and work in this converted unit and have subsequently created a toolkit to show others how they too can convert their rented accommodation into a private gallery space (d.ploy, 2011).

5.4 LEGACIES OF DD:LL IN THE CITY

One of the ways the legacies of DD:LL can be understood, is to examine the various ways in which the work, which they produced, affected the city itself. The pilot project focused on the Clongriffin area, in North Dublin. At the initial stages of the Love the City, the entire city centre was examined and following on from this macro examination, we focused on the area surrounding the DCC Fruit Markets, in Dublin 1. The effect, which DD:LL had on these specific geographical locations, is now described.
5.4.1 The impact of the pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place, on the city

As mentioned in Section 1.7.2, three out of the five prototype projects that were created through the pilot project, continued to grow after its cessation (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a). Some local residents in Clongriffin took ownership of them and continue to develop them. However, this was not the only positive legacy that DD:LL left in that area. According to the City Manager the project also helped to improve the relationship between DCC and the local community there. Thus it can be concluded that DD:LL contributed to growing the social capital in the area:

‘Well, I suppose we learnt a lot about the community piece, the great difficulty was that it coincided with the downturn in the economy and what you could or couldn’t do in the area, but the nucleus of that community is still there, in my view. And its interaction with the city council, I think, is much more positive.’ (Tierney, 2013)

5.4.2 Impact of Love the City on the city

The initial stage of Love the City focused on examining the entire city from a macro perspective. The aim, at this stage, was not to make alterations to or interventions in the city. Rather, it was to attempt to change how it the city was perceived by its citizens, highlighting its often underappreciated assets. Thus, this stage of the project can be viewed as an exercise in positive reframing. The main output of this part of the design process was an exhibition entitled ‘100 exciting things you did not know about the city centre’. This exhibition displayed 100 items in the city that were viewed as underappreciated wonders. These were sourced from a series of on-street interviews, which were carried out with passers-by. These items were then also tagged in their respective locations throughout the city. The exhibition is described in more detail in Section 4.9.2. Although, the exhibition feedback forms recorded a positive reaction to it, there is no evidence to suggest that it had any lasting effect on the mindset of the attendees. However, it appears to have inspired another exhibition, which DCC commissioned as part of Helsinki World Design Capital Exhibition. This particular exhibition, which was created by The Dublin Design Collective and was entitled Helsinki Tagged, used the same concept and a very similar format to the DD:LL exhibition. Helsinki Tagged also crowd-sourced multiple insights about the city and then displayed these insights throughout the city on physical tags in their respective locations. The same exhibition was subsequently commissioned by DCC, for Dublin. It was part of Design Week, a week-long festival, which celebrates design in Dublin. This time the exhibition was entitled Dublin Tagged (The Dublin Design Collective, 2012). Although, it has not been possible to measure if the DD:LL exhibition itself had a significant effect on its visitors, the fact that the concept was repeatedly commissioned by DCC demonstrates how they valued it.

---

29 This research references the following definition of ‘social capital’: ‘the network of social connections that exist between people, and their shared values and norms of behaviour, which enable and encourage mutually advantageous social cooperation’ (Dictionary.com, 2013)
In the latter stages of Love the City, the design team focused on examining a confined geographical area. This area was 0.7 km by 0.5 km and surrounded the DCC Fruit Markets, in Dublin 1. The design team developed a series of projects to aid in the revitalisation of this area of the city. Eight projects were developed and prototyped and they are described in detail in Section 4.9.5. Some of these projects, such as the ‘Creativity Network’ had the intention of having a longer term impact on the area, while others, such as ‘City Works’, intended to serve as demonstration projects for DCC. Unlike the pilot project, none of the prototype projects were adopted after the cessation of DD:LL. However, the City Architect acknowledged that Love the City did help to grow social capital in the Markets Area:

‘there is now a focus on trying to establish the Market as a markets, real markets area, again that has been there for a while, but it [DD:LL] seems to have galvanised the local businesses to look at some kind of a...at what needs to happen to turn the markets building into something more retail focused, rather than something that is more wholesale and closed down for most of the day.’ (Grehan, 2013)

The City Manager also acknowledged that DD:LL helped to improve the relationship between DCC and some of the organisations in the area, but that the area needs significantly more attention.

‘I’d say relationships have been improved with some of the organisations in the area, but there is still a lot of work to be done to drive forward the development of that area to its full potential, a lot of work to be done.’ (Tierney, 2013)

The City Manager also acknowledged that Love the City had identified and highlighted a critical issue in the Markets Area: that of wayfinding\(^\text{30}\). DCC are now considering how to deal with and how to improve this issue through making new routes through the area:

\(^{30}\) Wayfinding is a term introduced by the urban planner, Kevin Lynch to describe ‘a consistent use and organization of definite sensory cues from the external environment’ (Lynch, 1960).
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‘The difficulty of wayfinding to and through the Markets is rightly mentioned throughout the Compendium. Our City Architect’s Department is currently looking at possibilities of identifying and marking routes from Mary Street and Capel Street.’ (Tierney, 2011)

Also, as already mentioned in Section 5.3.2, one of the participants on the Love the City design team has subsequently set up Beta Projects, whose focus is to trial ideas to improve The Markets Area. Therefore, this initiative is having a direct impact on the city.

5.5 LEGACIES OF DD:LL IN THE WORKING CULTURE IN DCC

As stated in Section 1.7, the City Manager supported DD:LL for two interrelated reasons. Firstly, he was drawn to being involved in DD:LL, because he recognised that it offered a way of exploring how to collaboratively develop the city. Secondly, he was concerned about the bureaucratic and slow moving nature of the organisation, expressing unease about how the staff were becoming ‘victims of structure and tradition’ (Tierney, 2013). He wanted to address this institutional stagnation and had been grappling with the idea of ‘how you create different mindsets in the organisation’ (Tierney, 2013). DD:LL offered a way for his staff to learn a different, more lateral, more human-centred way of improving how the city functions. He hoped the seconded staff could bring this newly acquired skill back into their regular roles and infiltrate the organisation with a more enthusiastic, ‘can-do’ and optimistic attitude. This latter area of concern is focused upon in this section.

In total thirteen DCC staff members were accepted to partake in the initiative, over the course of both DD:LL projects. However, one staff member left Love the City early, after an initial two-month period, as mentioned in Section 4.9.2. Therefore, twelve DCC staff members received full training in how to apply design processes to generate solutions to complex, wicked problems in the city. As mentioned previously, five of these seconded staff members did not return to their previous roles within the organisation. Rather, they began to work in The Studio on their return to DCC. The other design team members returned to the original roles, armed with the experience of having partaken in the initiative. Ali Grehan, the City Architect, noted that these staff flourished as a result of the experience:

‘The people, certainly from the city side, have benefitted hugely and they have come out of it better….. They are they are much more capable. It was a capacity building exercise for the people who were involved.’ (Grehan, 2013)

The majority of the design team noted that it was a capacity building exercise for them also, pointing out how their confidence had grown over the course of their involvement with the initiative. However, it is questionable how far the initiative contributed to changing the working culture in the organisation. DCC has over 6000 members of staff in total. Changing the ‘mindset’ of an organisation of this size is a challenging prospect, especially given its bureaucratic and slow-moving culture. Also, only twelve staff members were trained in this alternative way of approaching their work. Infiltrating an organisation of 144
this size with an optimistic, 'can-do' attitude is a huge task for so few people. However, the City Manager claims that the initiative had some effect in this regard. When I questioned if he felt there had been a cultural change in the organisation, as a result of DD:LL, he responded,

'That I suppose is too big a claim, at this stage. Certainly it has made a difference, but we have a long way to go before you could say we have had a cultural change. And that's not unexpected in an organisation of this size, with its history and traditions and the manner in which services are delivered. But gradually over time that will change and this will be a fundamental part of that change.' (Tierney, 2013)

Dick Gleeson, the City Planner, had a slightly more pessimistic view of the situation and noted the resistance, within the organisation, to take on the 'spirit' of the project.

'I would have expected that it [DD:LL working methods] would have gone more mainstream and that it would have been more well received. But I did think that, and maybe it was a problem of communication, that people were very busy in various departments and doing their thing, but I felt that there was a sort of, I wouldn't call it cynicism, but a reluctance to embrace the philosophy and the spirit....'(Gleeson, 2013)

All Grehan, the City Architect, also noted the reluctance, within the organisation, to take on the methods and the principles of DD:LL. She also noted the difficulties associated with creating cultural change in such a large organisation and offered some insight as to why this is the case.

'Whether, we are all jumping around now to Designing Dublin principles, we are not, because the City Council is a big organisation. There are 6000 people, we move slowly. I don't apologise for that. I used to apologise for that, saying oh, we need to be quicker. Hang on a second, we've got real, all sorts of constraints to operate in. We have a whole range of approvals that they don't have the private sector, whether it's reporting to the department, the government, obviously to our own councillors. We have systems that we have to apply and that means that things move slowly. But cities move slowly, cities don't change in six months. Cities are long term things and the city council has to keep pace with the city and also has to lead the pace for the city. And also, it cannot be expected to kind of turn things inside out over night.' (Grehan, 2013)

5.5.1 The legacy of using alternative public consultation methods

There are some more definite legacies, which DD:LL has imparted to the working culture in DCC. For instance, the initiative has influenced and informed the public consultation methods, which DCC now use. The manner in which this happened is now explained.

In the summer of 2011 and on the foot of the public consultation work that was carried out during Love the City, DCC contracted the Love the City design team to carry out on-street public consultation as a way
of helping to progress their vision statement for the Grafton Street Refurbishment Strategy\(^{31}\). The brief was to engage with a random selection of city centres users, to uncover insights about how they felt about the area and to discover what they might change about the city given the opportunity.

We constructed a tower of cardboard boxes in various locations throughout the city. They acted as a spectacle and to lure people into conversation. The tower was covered with posters that invited people to contribute their thoughts about the area. At these towers, we conducted interviews with passersby. The responses were recorded on multi-coloured paper and subsequently pinned to the tower of boxes. We also asked people if they would like to express their thoughts about the area on an A3 sheet and then be photographed with this personal expression. We did this as a way of trying to allow Dublin City Council get a 'feel for' who they were creating this vision statement for. Over a period of four days, 477 people were consulted in various locations throughout the city.

The public reaction to this on-street consultation process was very positive. In some locations people queued up to have their opinions and thoughts recorded. The Studio subsequently used the same to process to garner insights and public opinion for the development of their Public Realm Strategy (Conroy and Mooney, 2011). They used the same public consultation process again when developing the strategy for the Docklands Strategic Development Zone\(^{32}\) (The Studio, 2012).

> 'When we did the SDZ [strategic development zone] as well, we did all of this consultation we were telling you about, we did workshops etc, then we got The Studio to do street conversations. Now, they had already done street conversations for the Grafton Street project and it's become the way to do things.' (Gleeson, 2013)

Dick Gleeson also noted that having been involved in DD:LL, through the steering group, has influenced how he goes about his own work. For instance, he claims that it encouraged him to do much more grassroots studies for the Docklands SDZ Report.

\(^{31}\) Grafton Street is one of Dublin's two main shopping streets and one of the top attractions in the city. It caters for a high-end shopping experience and the area surrounding it has a mix of recreational, cultural, civic and residential uses. Therefore, this street is very prominent in terms of maintaining the economic and social health of the city. However, the street is in need of some upgrading. The dyed concrete brick paving was laid in the mid-1980's and is badly damaged and in very poor repair. DCC considered the upgrading of this paving to be imperative and saw this work project as an opportunity to establish a regeneration plan for Grafton Street and its environs. Thus, the 'Grafton Street Quarter Public Realm Enhancement Project' was initiated. The first stage in developing this plan was to create a vision statement and they wanted this statement to be informed and driven by the needs, wants, ideas, thoughts and desires of the end user. They contracted the Love the City design team to extract these insights.

\(^{32}\) Section 166 of the 2000 Planning and Development Act gives an outline of what a strategic development zone is. It states that 'where, in the opinion of the Government, specified development is of economic or social importance to the State, the Government may be ordered, when so proposed by the Minister, to designate one or more sites for the establishment, in accordance with the provisions of this Part, of a strategic development zone to facilitate such development.' (Keane, 2003)
5.5.2 The legacy of using the concept of prototyping

A concept that DD:LL championed is the iterative trialling ideas prior to permanent implementation or as it is referred to in design parlance ‘prototyping’. It is noted in Section 2.2.1 that early-stage prototyping is a key aspect of any codified design processes. It is described as a key part of the DD:LL design process as follows:

‘testing out the ideas, making them real and getting the users involved in understanding their effectiveness. Iterating the prototypes, improving them each time to end up with a robust outcome. Looking at each iteration with a critical eye and constantly refining.’ (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a, p. 12)

Through exposure to DD:LL, DCC has began to prototype various aspects of their work. There is a number of different instances, which bear testament to this fact and they are now described.
5.5.2.1 The public realm strategy as a work in progress

The City Architect noted that DCC were taking a 'prototyping approach' to the development of the public realm strategy and this choice of approach was directly influenced by DD:LL.

'...we are also taking that approach (a prototyping approach) with the public realm strategy and I think that was informed by Designing Dublin.' (Grehan, 2013)

The idea of prototyping has been applied in two different aspects of this development. Firstly, the public realm strategy document itself will be worked upon in an iterative fashion, progressing particular elements of it based on what proved to be successful in practice. The City Planner pointed out the rationale for taking this kind of approach.

'We have just done the public realm strategy and I think again, it represents a kind of agility that something like public realm strategy should have. We have been too fond in the past of making an over-elaborate, completed document, which is costly to produce and then impossible to implement, because it includes so much. So what we have now is a document that is always going to be in Beta and it is a two year document and it will be reviewed every year...’ (Gleeson, 2013)

In adopting this approach, DCC accepted that making some imperfect progress was preferable to making no progress at all. Their aim, with the creation of this public realm strategy, is to get the process started and to improving it over time. This approach helped to prevent the process, of creating this strategy, from stagnating.

5.5.2.2 Physical prototyping in the city

DD:LL has also passed on to DCC the practice of creating full-scale, physical prototypes of proposed public realm improvement projects in-situ. This was noted by the City Manager in an email, which can be found in Appendix 6, that he sent to the D21C founders and that was subsequently forwarded to members of the DD:LL design team.

'The City Council has learned a lot from how you worked with others and how you prototyped street furniture, posters and other installations on the street. These are aspects we wish to include both in the Grafton Street Area Enhancement Plan and in forthcoming Public Realm initiatives'. (Tierney, 2011)

The City Planner acknowledged the rationale for working in this kind of way.

'it's a much better way of finding out if you've got the basic principle right. I see it as being a very useful, budget conscious and transparent way of working.' (Gleeson, 2013)

The projects where they used such an urban prototyping approach are now described.
Fade Street as a ‘Pilot Project’

Fade Street is located in the ‘Grafton Street Quarter’ area. Therefore, it was due to be upgraded as part of the public realm enhancement project for the area, details of which are given in Section 5.5.1. The street was upgraded in a temporary manner with a view to using this project as a way of testing ideas for the enhancement of the entire area (Leonard and Scannell, 2011). The temporary upgrading consisted of the widening of the footpaths for the resurfacing of the road, the placement of large planter boxes along this widened footpath, new street lamps and the installation of stainless steel bollards and bicycle racks. The newly widened footpaths were resurfaced in a resin-bonded aggregate, leaving the original granite kerbstones in place. This, according to the project architect, was adhering to the ‘temporary’ nature of the project, thus ensuring full reversibility. The project cost €190.00 per square metre, which is a fraction of other public more permanent enhancement projects in the city. For instance, the upgrading of O’Connell Street cost €700.00 per square meter (Gleeson, 2013).

Figure 47 - The Fade Street temporary upgrading project.

Clarendon Street / Clarendon Row as a temporary scheme

Clarendon Street and Clarendon Row are also located in the Grafton Street Quarter. On these streets, DCC have also removed the on-street car parking and temporarily widened the footpaths, with a view to testing the idea before a more permanent implementation of it. The newly created space for pedestrians is separated from the roadway with large concrete planters. An artist was commissioned to create a public art piece for this new ‘footpath’. Using the visual language of street markings, she painted quotes about walking in the city on the street and on the concrete planters. According to the DCC website, the purpose of this art installation is ‘to be attractive and to create interest, intrigue and comment.’ Also according to this website, the temporary works ‘give businesses an opportunity to explore the potential for improved street activity.’ (Dublin City Council, 2012a) This project cost €60.00 per square meter.
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Figure 48 - The Clarendon Street / Clarendon temporary pedestrianisation.

Prototyping in the Fruit and Vegetable Markets Building

DCC have also adopted the concept of prototyping as a way of progressing the conversion of the Markets Building from wholesale to retail, as the City Manager note in a thank you email, which he sent to the DD:LL founders, post completion of Love the City:

'The Fruit and Vegetable Markets will be prototyping new retail elements during innovation month. Dublin City Council Development Department are investigating possibilities of developing this market and are learning from successful markets elsewhere. In true Designing Dublin style the proposal will be prototyped at an early stage to test the concept.' (Tierney, 2011)

5.6 Conclusion

There are numerous legacies that DD:LL imparted to Dublin. It spawned five new initiatives. It also left some lasting imprints on the city itself, with some of the prototype projects continuing to be developed by Dublin's users. Also, DCC have adopted some DD:LL working methods. They now use street conversations as a way of garnering public opinion about particular issues. They have adopted the practice of physically prototyping proposals for improving the public realm. Also, a result of their exposure to DD:LL, DCC are now trialling new working groups and new approaches for creating city development policy. Therefore, it can be concluded that, although a third iteration of DD:LL was never realised, the various legacies imparted suggest that and it has had significant impact on the city.
Figure 49 - Sample of analysis diagrams
6 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

'At their best design methods and design thinking catalyse people to see issues and possibilities in a fresh way. They spark creativity and help us to spot the possible connections between things, which so often become obscured by the silos of daily life, which dominate governments and businesses alike. Be we're at a fascinating moment when design needs to learn as well as teach if its full potential is to be realised.'


6.1 THE INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I present an analysis of the approach used by DD:LL to revitalise the city. I examine and discuss it as a strategy for collaboratively developing Dublin and unravel its advantages and disadvantages. Hence, the major findings of the research and responses to a number of the questions set out in Chapter 1 are presented here. The chapter begins by putting the findings in context through presenting a visualisation of Love the City. I developed this visualisation as a result of the case study and subsequent analysis through diagramming. In Section 6.3, I explore the nature of collaboration on Love the City and I show that it was inclusive of an even more extensive range of actors than what might have been assumed from the examination of the pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place. However, despite it being inclusive of a diverse range of actors, I found that the interaction with many of those actors to be lacking in some depth. Section 6.4 focuses on the three different ways in which DD:LL aimed to make effective use of resources. Here, I show that some of these tactics worked while others did not always lead to the best outcomes. Section 6.5 goes on to address how the initiative fed into DCC’s capacity for collaborative city development and, in doing so, follows on from the material in Chapter 5, in which I uncovered the legacies of DD:LL. This chapter also illustrates how these legacies impacted DCC, specifically in relation to the capacity for collaborative city development. A key finding is that, in its current conceptualisation, DD:LL as an approach to collaborative city development is not scalable. Unexpectedly, this is because it relied too heavily on the goodwill of volunteers.

Despite some problematic issues, it has to be said that DD:LL offers a very significant experiment in this emerging area of design. The project was timely, and can provide guidance for future city design laboratories. Hence the chapter concludes with a set of recommendations for such future initiatives that

---

Table 1, which describes how Love the City relates to other DD:LL projects is repeated here, for efficient orientation purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Location</th>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD:LL 1.0 (the pilot project)</td>
<td>Clongriffin</td>
<td>Finding the Hidden Potential of Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD:LL 2.0</td>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>The Discovery Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the City (in-depth case study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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draw on the strengths of DD:LL and my learning from the experience. Recommendations for developing the practice of urban prototyping are presented here also.

All of the findings were informed by 26 weeks of participant observation of *Love the City*, three follow-up interviews with high level DCC officials and many more hours of industry ethnography. They were also informed by the wider readings that influenced the thesis. I used the constant comparison method to check my emergent findings against the DD:LL blog, the blogs of the other design team members and the DD:LL Compendium (Designing Dublin: Learning-to-Learn, 2011a). Therefore, I employed methodological triangulation, data triangulation and informant triangulation throughout the analysis process.

6.2 VISUALISING THE COMPLEXITY OF *LOVE THE CITY*

Unsurprisingly, through carrying out the in-depth case study of *Love the City*, I found the approach used by DD:LL to revitalise the city to be much more complex than I had first assumed. As mentioned in the opening remarks to this chapter, an understanding of the complexity involved provides a wider basis for answering the research questions as set out in Chapter 1. I found that there were more actors involved, in a greater variety of ways than I had originally postulated. There were also more design related activities happening in parallel rather than in series, as I had assumed. I had also not expected the range of conflicts to be as extensive as they were. Therefore, in the first instance, I felt it was necessary to make sense of all this complexity. A long process of analysing and developing an understanding of *Love the City* ensued. The description of the project in Chapter 4 and the visualisation of its evolution, which is presented in Figure 50, synthesise the findings of this extensive analysis. They are the output of this process of having developed a deep understanding of the project. Through them, I aim to communicate my developed understanding of their approach.

---

34 For a definition of this term please see section 3.8.5.
Naturally, I can map my own path more definitively than the other members of the design team, through referencing my reflective notebooks. How the various influencing factors affected my path are shown through changes in my trajectory.

Figure 50 - Love the City Visualisation.
6.2.1 The process of creating the visualisation of Love the City described

I created the visualisation in Figure 50 in tandem with the written description of the project in Chapter 4. Its development was influenced and informed by the emerging description in Chapter 4, and this description, in turn, was influenced and informed by subsequent iterations of the visualisation. A sample of earlier iterations of this visualisation can be found in Appendix 7 and Appendix 8. Throughout the analysis process and over the course of this research project, I continually developed a timeline of how Love the City developed, on the wall of my research unit. This timeline noted all design related activities, significant events, conflicts, collaborations and relevant quotes from Love the City. It was a constant work in progress. As I reviewed the data, I noted patterns and emergent connections on the timeline. Over a period of 18 months, a rich picture of the complexity of the project started to emerge, see Figure 51.

In this thesis, I distinguish between the term visualisation and diagram. I use the term diagram to describe a schematic representation of an entity or a description of the principles of how that entity works and how the different parts relate to the whole. I use the term visualisation to describe the act of forming an image of actual events. Therefore, I say that Figure 7, from Chapter 1, is a diagram of the DD:LL approach, as understood from the cursory study of the pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place. On the other hand, Figure 50 is a visualisation resulting from direct experience and a deep understanding of what actually took place on Love the City. For the purposes of a quick comparison, both

Figure 51 - The evolving Love the City timeline on the wall of my research unit.
figures are juxtaposed in Figure 52. It is obvious, from even a quick glance, that a more nuanced and detailed understanding of the approach used by DD:LL is encapsulated in the visualisation.

Figure 52 - Diagram of collaboration on the pilot project (left) and visualisation of collaboration on Love the City (right).

6.2.2 The visualisation of Love the City described

As mentioned earlier, due to the fact that visual descriptions have their own unique qualities, which are distinct from the written word, it is not possible to describe every detail of them through text. However, certain key aspects of the visualisation are now described, in order to ensure clarity in the reading of particular elements of it. The different actors are coloured according to their designated roles, as described in Section 4.6: the DCC staff (cyan), the unpaid volunteers (red), the D21C staff (purple), the inspiring speakers (green), the random selection of users engaged through street conversation (shades of beige), the targeted selection of users engaged through the scheduled conversations (orange) and the prototype collaborators (yellow). The central zone of the visualisation describes the design process, the upper zone of the diagram depicts the actors who provided influence and advice throughout the project and the lower zone describes the actors whose designated role was to provide inspiration for the design process. Both of these sets of actors exerted influence on the design process and helped shape its trajectory. This influence is expressed as arrowed lines, emanating from them and into the central zone. These lines are the same colour as the actors from which they originate. This colour scheme references that which was used in the earlier diagram of the pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place, in Figure 8. The broad outline brief, as described in Section 4.4, is illustrated by the thick purple line emanating from the Creative Director. The intention was to highlight that I found her to be a pivotal anchor in the project, yet she did not always act as the project’s spokesperson. Therefore, she is shown in the visualisation at a much smaller size than in Figure 8, where I assumed she played a more visible role in the project. This line extends around all activity and contains the weekly timeline at the bottom of the page. Thick, purple vertical lines are indicated where there were project deliverables, as stipulated by the Creative Director in the outline brief. The major design outputs are noted with blue circles and the minor design outputs with grey circles. These thick purple lines, along with blue and grey circles thus shape the design process of each member of the design team, which are illustrated with wavy lines, emanating from them. The wavy nature of these lines intends to express the non-linear nature of the
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process. Noteworthy conflicts, which occurred throughout the process, are also mapped and named. The points at which three of the design team members left the project, before its completion, are indicated with red hexagons.

There are some notable differences between the diagram in Figure 8 and visualisation in Figure 50. For instance, in Figure 8, I expressed the trajectory of the design team as a single wavy line, inscribed inside the outline brief. However, in Figure 50, I expressed the trajectory of each member of the design team as an individual line. Therefore, twelve distinct design process trajectories are expressed. These lines converge when there is a group deliverable, such as the exhibition in week ten. They also converge where subgroups create minor design outputs together. This articulation of the individual design trajectories reflects an aspect of the refined understanding of the approach, which I gained from the in-depth study of Love the City. I found that each design team member contributed to the project as an individual with their own voice and each of these voices was weighted equally in the process. The design process did not progress smoothly, as the group did not work together as one coherent unit. Rather, there were twelve unique voices that sometimes converged to work together within the process and that sometimes aligned with each other to support each other’s work and that at other times repelled each other, because of differences of opinion or indifference. With this amount of voices working together, noise and chaos often ensued and I also tried to express this quality through the visualisation.

My own trajectory through the design process is depicted as a thick red line. Unsurprisingly, I was able to draw this line more definitively than the other design trajectories, through referencing my own reflexive journals and diary entries, which I kept consistently throughout the process. For instance, I found one of the inspiring speakers, Anastasia Crickley (the head of social sciences from the National University of Ireland, Maynooth), to have been particularly influential on my own design process. Therefore, my design trajectory changed sharply at this point. I also found that towards the end of the project, the noise in the design studio started to take its toll on me and I began to work more on my own. Therefore, from week 20 onwards, the red line sits slightly apart from the rest of the group. The other design team members’ trajectories are noted with dashed lines, signifying my tentative knowledge about their exact design trajectories and how they were influenced by various encounters.

Throughout the design process, I noted that some actors took it upon themselves to contribute to the process in a manner that was unanticipated. For instance, some of the inspiring speakers made themselves available to members of the design team who contacted them for additional advice, help or guidance. Therefore, they contributed to a later stage of the design process. Also, towards the end of the project, some members of the steering group dropped by the design studio, in an ad-hoc manner, to offer advice for the design process. In this way, these actors started to act outside the boundaries of their designated role. I depict this unanticipated behaviour with dashed lines emanating from the actors in question. I have also described these instances in Section 6.3.2. Also, it should be noted that the
design team devised methods, as part of the design process, to engage the city user, e.g. with street conversations and scheduled conversations. Therefore, these engaged users are placed within the design process zone.

In keeping with the original diagram (Figure 7, Chapter 1), I depict the steering group as having one voice. At the steering group meetings, I found that they acted as one unit, supporting each other’s individual feedback. However, towards the end of the project, the various members of the group were each individually partnered with a particular prototype, as described in Section 4.6.3. Therefore, for a short period of time, they each helped to co-design a prototype project and inform its implementation, through giving pragmatic advice regarding its realisation. These instances are noted with arrowed lines which terminate in the prototype.

6.3 THE NATURE OF THE PARTICIPATION IN LOVE THE CITY REVEALED

In Love the City, there were instances where people were invited to become involved in the project and there were also instances where people became involved in an ad-hoc or unplanned manner. The natures of both of these types of interactions are discussed in this section.

6.3.1 The nature of the instances of planned participation

Love the City was inclusive of a much wider range of actors than what might have been expected, based on the cursory study of the pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place. This range of actors and their designated roles are described in Section 4.6. This material is summarised in Table 3, which also adds some pertinent details. It illustrates the quantity of actors in each group, how they became involved in the project and the approximate number of man hours they contributed to it. This calculation is based on a 40 hour working week. These numbers are approximated, as it is difficult to keep track of exactly how many hours some of the part-time volunteers dedicated to the project, due to the sheer number of people involved. Table 3 also gives a flavour of how they participated in Love the City and the nature of their involvement. This lays some foundations for the discussions that follow, which shed light on the substance of the collaborations involved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project actors (No. in brackets)</th>
<th>How they came to be involved in <em>Love the City</em></th>
<th>The nature of the participation in <em>Love the City</em></th>
<th>Approximate no. of man hours contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Founding Partners (2)       | They founded D21C                             | • Oversaw the project development and guided the design process, through being part of the steering group  
• Lobbied for the further development of D2:LL  
• Networked extensively to promote *Love the City* | 1,456                                      |
| The Creative Director (1)       | Employed by D21C                             | • Created the outline brief, working plan and outline for outputs  
• Managed and oversaw the project development  
• Laid out the daily design related activities and guided the design process  
• Managed the design team leaders | 1,040                                      |
| The design team Leaders (3)     | Employed by D21C after they had worked on the pilot project | • Supported the Creative Director  
• Guided the design process in the Creative Director’s absence  
• Gave IT support and managed the project’s social media activities  
• Designed the promotional material  
• Managed the budgeting issues | 3,120                                      |
| The design team (12 for 8 weeks, 11 for 12 weeks, 10 for 2 weeks) | We made an application to join the project and subsequently competed to join the team through a one day interview process | • Completed the design related activities as laid out by the Creative Director  
• Contributed in a generative manner to the design process  
• Reviewed books related to the project | The volunteers 7,080  
The seconded DCC staff 4,480 |
| The steering group (11)         | They were stakeholders in the project, from its inceptions and they supported its creation | • Reviewed the work in progress  
• Provided guidance and support for the design process  
• Provided contacts for the project  
• Helped and supported the realisation of the prototypes | 99                                      |
| The inspiring speakers (25)     | The Creative Director invited 22 speakers and the design team invited 3 additional speakers to present their work to the design team | • Presented their work  
• Gave a 5-10 minute question and answer session to the design team | 25                                      |
| The project advisors (4)        | The Creative Director contracted them to give workshops to the design team | • Gave training to the design team in specific subject areas | 40                                      |
| The representatives from parallel projects (4) | The Creative Director invited them to tell the design team about their work | • Presented projects which bore resonances with *Love the City* | 6                                       |
| Users engaged through street conversations in the city centre (1,000 approx.) | In public space, the design team invited people to give them insights about the city centre | • Short conversations where we sought insights about why they were and were not coming into the city centre, insights about what they liked and did not like about the city centre and ideas about what they might change about the city centre, if they had the opportunity | 83.3 (based on conversations averaging 5 minutes each approx.) |
6.3.2 The nature of the instances of unplanned participation

There were also instances where people gave input to *Love the City* in an unplanned and ad-hoc manner. These instances are now detailed and the nature of these interactions is described. It was deemed to be important to analyse these instances also in order to get a full understanding of the overall nature of the participation in *Love the City*.

**Observation 1: The exhibition, 100 exciting things you did not know about the city centre, garnered further input and helped build the DD:LL network.**

There were 350 visitors to the exhibition. We saw this event as an opportunity to source more information about the city and about where we should focus our efforts in Stage B of the project. Therefore, we requested these visitors to fill in feedback forms, which aimed to garner this information. We had 176 responses in total and these had some impact on the choice of localised study area. Again, this participation was not particularly substantial. However, the exhibition and this activity provided a vehicle to help raise awareness of the project and to help build the DD:LL network further. Subsequently, some people in this network became prototype co-producers. So, although the exhibition did not provide...
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an opportunity for the design team to interact with the user in a profound manner; it opened up further opportunities for less superficial engagement.

Observation 2: The sites of the prototypes garnered input from the passerby.
The physical sites, where the prototypes were tested, also became spaces where the design team interacted with the user. In a similar way to the spectacles created in the street conversations, they acted as enticing objects, luring people into conversation. Requests for feedback about the proposals were also advertised, through posters which were erected in-situ. For the day of The Prototype Extravaganza, we were on hand, at the sites of the prototypes, ready to gather reactions from the user. Again, this interaction was one-way, where user was invited to give a reaction to an already formulated plan. Therefore, it was also somewhat superficial.

Observation 3: DD:LL network became a significant aspect of the project and it was regularly drawn upon for sporadic assistance and specific knowledge.
Over the course of all of the DD:LL projects, a broad and diverse network of initiative supporters was established. I observed that the Love the City design team drew on the expertise in this network, from time to time. For instance, one of the inspiring speakers, a socially conscious graffiti artist, was contacted at the prototype realisation stage about giving practical advice regarding the erection of large-scale posters in external locations.

Observation 4: The location of the design studio facilitated casual encounters in the Markets Area.
As already mentioned in Section 4.3.2, the DD:LL design studio was coincidentally located in The Markets Area. This fact aided in casually building up a network of local contacts, which were made through encounters such as having lunch in the area, socialising in the area and walking to and from work. For instance, in the 10 Enterprises/10 Days/10 Tests prototype, the project leader was having difficulty locating a vacant warehouse proprietor, who was willing to give a temporary lease for housing the Laboratory of Enterprise. Then, co-incidentally, another design team member casually met a willing proprietor, while having lunch in the area.

Observation 5: The project solicit proposals from people to collaborate.
Another feature of DD:LL, which supported the creation of these unanticipated instances of participation, was the way the initiative communicated a willingness to collaborate. This was an integral part of the culture of the project. Many different people approached the Creative Director with ideas about how they might contribute. She met with all proposers and this openness resulted in forming two particularly productive relationships. The first was with a local radio DJ. In December 2010, he contacted the Creative Director with an idea about making a series of radio shows about the project. The proposal was endorsed by DD:LL and 10 radio shows were produced. These shows were then used as a platform to garner further input and feedback from city users. A second very fruitful collaboration, of this kind,
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was had with an amateur documentary filmmaker. In February 2011, he approached the Creative Director with a proposal to make a documentary about the initiative. She agreed to this proposal and he then devoted significant time to filming the various happenings in Love the City. He also became an active agent in the design studio, offering help and advice in designing and implementing the prototypes.

Observation 6: The welcoming atmosphere in the design studio encouraged ad-hoc visits from the steering group.

The open and welcoming atmosphere in the design studio also meant that some members of the steering group felt comfortable visiting in an ad-hoc manner to offer, what they considered to be, critical, timely advice. For instance, the City Planner visited one afternoon to offer guidance about the development of some of the particular prototypes. The location of the design studio, being in close proximity to DCC offices, encouraged these casual visits from members of the steering group.

Observation 7: The 'gatekeepers' acted as facilitators of interaction with people in The Markets Area.

At Stage B of the project, we identified some critical people in The Markets Area who were well connected to the social networks there and who had an intimate knowledge of the place. We referred to them as 'gatekeepers' and they included the parish priest, the local artist, the man who ran the community after-school program, the owner of the fishing tackle shop, the local publican, the manager of the Markets Building and one of the local florists. These people became critical contacts for the project, helping to implement the prototypes in various ways. For example, they introduced us to other critical people in the community, helped identify and secure sites in which to test the prototypes. They also participated in realising many of the prototype projects.

6.3.3 The nature of participation in Love the City concluded

There are many conclusions that can be drawn about the nature of the participation in Love the City. Both Arstein's model of participation, which was first introduced in Section 1.4.4, and Steen's model of the landscape of human centred design, which was first introduced in Section 2.5, are used to orientate this discussion. For convenience purposes, they are reproduced here in Figure 53.
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Figure 53 - Steen’s model of the landscape of human-centred design (left) and Arstein’s model of citizen participation (right).

Conclusion 1: DD:LL continuously communicated that they were open to the possibility of collaborating with others and this resulted in the forming of some productive partnerships.

DD:LL went to great lengths to communicate their willingness to collaborate with others. Posters, badges, postcards, social media, events and the initiative’s website and blog were all used extensively to communicate this message. It was a time consuming, but a worthwhile activity, which helped to raise awareness about the project and to establish some fruitful partnerships.

Conclusion 2: Spending time building the DD:LL project network was worthwhile.

At critical times in Love the City, the design team drew on the expertise in this network. These contacts were particularly helping at the prototype implementation stage.

Conclusion 2: The majority of people who participated in Love the City were invited to do so by either the design team or the Creative Director and the nature of this participation was quite superficial.

There were only a few minor instances that allowed for more substantive participation to occur. For instance, the scheduled conversations allowed for 35 people to contribute to the process in a generative capacity.

Conclusion 3: The design team were the conduits for the garnered information, and their biases were not accounted for. The information that was inputted into the design process was muddled. For these reasons, the conclusions may not have been representative.

A major deduction from these observations is that the design team became the conduits through which the garnered information was filtered into the design process. The design process did not allow for personal biases to be accounted for. Given the lack of attention that the design team placed on self-awareness, there was no guarantee that the input, from all the various participants, was incorporated
into their design processes. It should also be noted that the design process was further muddled because a standardised method for extracting information from the city user was not employed. Furthermore, this extracted information was not recorded or transcribed in a systematic manner. Therefore, while these interactions helped us develop our personal understanding of the situation in the city centre, they did not necessarily allow for the user to contribute to the design process in an authentic manner.

**Conclusion 4:** The design process was a quagmire where the information was deposited. The design studio became the bottleneck where the garnered information was shared and discussed amongst the design team. The perimeter walls were used to display the information, so in this physical space we were immersed in the cacophony of findings. At times the design process was chaotic, given the very broad range of inputs that were acquired and the lack of a coherent system of extracting, recording, transcribing, disseminating and filing this information. The sense of disorder was exacerbated by there being no ownership of desks and no place in which to store work in progress or personal belongings. Therefore, each morning began with cleaning up a space in which to work and attempting to put some order on somebody else’s work, which had been left there from the previous day. There was also a sense of chaos and confusion associated with the broad outline brief. *Love the City* had an extensive agenda with very few boundaries. The aim of the process was to ‘improve the city’ and it was driven by the ‘needs’ as uncovered through the participatory process. However, the type of ‘needs’ being addressed was never stipulated. Maslow (1943) has pointed out human needs can vary greatly and can range from physiological ‘needs’ to the ‘need’ to attain transcendence. The type and scale of the ‘improvement’ we were aiming to make was never stipulated or agreed upon. Also, a designated city user group was never specified. Therefore, aiming to generally ‘improve the city’ while being driven by the ‘needs’ of the user is an incredibly nebulous task, and the scope of the project is potentially limitless. The process being employed was akin to Bruce Mau’s ‘lost in the woods’ methodology, which was described in Section 2.3.2. This approach relies on the valuing of all information related to the subject of inquiry and then using ones intuition to ‘feel out’ a situation as a way of making progress. However, making progress using such an intuitive process proved to be difficult, and the approach necessitated long hours of discussion. Around week 5 of the project, discontent amongst the design team began to brew. In Section 4.9.2 this event is referred to as ‘Conflict 1 – Lost in the Woods’. At this point, some of the design team members began to feel overwhelmed at the scale of the project, the lack of referencing established research methods and the general sense of disorder in the design studio. The design team’s original sense of optimism and positivity began to dwindle as some design team members became frustrated with the very open-ended nature of the project. A frustrated design team summed up the situation when she remarked ‘We are not lost in the woods in here, we are wading through a quagmire.’

**Conclusion 5:** The research activities carried out on *Love the City* can be categorised as instances of empathetic design or contextual design, however, they cannot be considered instances of co-design.
I conclude that the majority of the design related activities, which were undertaken as part of the *Love the City* design process, are most accurately described as instances of empathetic design or contextually sensitive design. The focus with both of these approaches is on designing *for* rather than *with* the user. They differ from a co-design process, where the users and the designers work together, from the moment of inception, developing proposal. In *Love the City*, a co-design process was not employed.

### 6.4 THE TACTICS TO MAKE EFFECTIVE USE OF RESOURCES RE-EXAMINED

From the cursory study of the pilot project, *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place*, I concluded that the DD:LL approach used three particular tactics to make effective use of resources, as described in Section 1.8.2. They are now re-examined in light of having carried out the in-depth study of *Love the City*.

#### 6.4.1 Re-examining Tactic 1, urban prototyping

Development using urban prototyping was seen to be resource effective because it offered an opportunity for potential solutions to be tested in a short-term capacity, using limited resources, prior to a more resource intensive and permanent implementation of an improvement. The various observations about this practice on *Love the City* are now noted. Then, conclusions are drawn about the effectiveness of this tactic.

**Observation 1 – Urban Prototyping was an integral part of the DD:LL working method.**

The practice of urban prototyping was developed as a way of working over the course of *Love the City* and was initially embedded as a working method in week 2 of the project. The design team were tasked with turning one of their most popular sketch ideas into a live prototype, over a period of seven hours, as described in Section 4.9.1. The prototypes were constructed simply and quickly, using whatever materials were free in the design studio. For instance, one idea for improving the city was to have announcements at each of the tram stops describing an interesting fact or a piece of information about the destination. A prototype of this idea was created at a tram stop through the erection of posters with this information. The prototype implementer then talked to people there about the idea in order to garner their reaction to it. This early activity began to build up a way of working in the design team, instilling an attitude of 'just try it out and see what happens'. Such testing of ideas in the public realm, or urban prototyping, became part of the shared toolkit of the design team and was used several times throughout the 26 weeks.

**Observation 2 – The nature of the urban prototyping employed was ‘quick and dirty’ and this aesthetic was important as a way of encouraging the user to become involved in the development process.**

The urban prototyping that was employed in *Love the City* aimed to try things out simply and quickly, using whatever materials were free in the design studio. We referred to it as a ‘quick and dirty’ approach
and we borrowed visual language from pop-up theatre, performance art, DIY urbanism, tactical urbanism and design activism. I found that this aesthetic was important for encouraging interaction with the passerby. It signalled to them that what we were doing was a trial and, thus, it left room for interpretation, comment and improvement. For instance, the 'Pimp my Pavement' prototype, which was described in Section 4.9.5, invited much on-street interaction and this aesthetic helped in this regard.

Observation 3 – The activity of urban prototyping acted as an alluring engagement tool.
I observed that the activity of urban prototyping can be an effective engagement tool, in and of itself. This unusual activity aroused curiosity in the passerby who often engaged with the process and gave feedback about the intervention. It is important to stress that the activity of making the intervention in a public space was what often drew attention from the passerby, and not necessarily the physical intervention itself. This finding echoes observations by Whyte, Gehl and Jacobs where they note that what attracts people most in the urban realm is other people (Whyte, 1988, Gehl, 2010, Jacobs, 1962).

Observation 4 - Urban prototypes can create a physical space for deliberation.
I found that some of the prototypes created a physical space for deliberation, among diverse and curious groups of people who gathered around them. In this way, the prototypes themselves acted as a mediating device or a prop to talk through. Also, in a similar way to the spectacles created in the street conversations, they lured people into conversation. However, urban prototypes catalysed more specific conversations, asking people to look at the existing situation in a new way and talking about a specific proposal.

Observation 5 - Urban prototyping is revitalising.
Urban prototyping is not just a tool for testing ideas, it is in itself revitalising. The Prototype Extravaganza demonstrated this fact. On that day, there were many people on the streets viewing the prototypes, talking through the prototypes and as a result, talking to each other. Habraken, Hamdi, Gehl, Jacobs, Lynch and Sennett all remind us that vital cities are a work in progress, a collective creation and a conglomeration of incremental additions being constantly in a state of flux and emergence. (Habraken, 2000, Hamdi, 2004, Jacobs, 1961, Sennett, 2006, Gehl, 2010) Urban prototyping helps to amplify this quality of vital cities.

Observation 4 - Urban prototyping is a clear representation of a proposal.
I found that urban prototyping is a democratic way of consulting the public about an idea. It makes a proposal readily comprehensible and is less abstract than communicating an idea through a representative drawing or scaled model. For instance, the Golden Path prototype, as described in Section 4.9.5, clearly communicated, to the user, how pedestrianising that part of the street would look, feel and operate.
Observation 6 - *Love the City* uncovered barriers to the practice of urban prototyping.

*Love the City* revealed that implementing prototypes in the public realm can be challenging. In table 4, with reference to each of the eight prototypes in *Love the City*, I note the various barriers and blockages which they encountered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototype</th>
<th>Barriers and hurdles encountered</th>
<th>Barriers and hurdles resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Enterprises, 10 Days, 10 Tests</td>
<td>A short-term lease in the area was required to house the Laboratory of Enterprise associated with the project. This was very difficult to find despite the abundance of vacant property in the area. Also, DD:LL had a very limited budget, so cost was a major concern.</td>
<td>Serendipitously, and aided by the fact that the design studio was located in the working area, a willing landlord was found. Walking back from lunch, he was standing on a street corner in The Markets Area. He was introduced to me through one of the gatekeepers in the area. I explained the proposal to him and he was excited about the idea. He agreed to donate one of his vacant warehouses to the initiative to be used as a Laboratory of Enterprise over a period of three consecutive days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microcosmic Intervention</td>
<td>This project encountered many difficulties in finding willing collaborators in the area to help with it realisation.</td>
<td>Without having found willing collaborators, the project leader started the implementation her own ‘improvement’ project, choosing to see herself as a catalyst for DIY urbanism, and demonstrating, in a very public way, how easily precinct improvement can be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Works</td>
<td>I needed permission to erect the large scale posters from both DCC and the property owners. Suitable and willing library participants needed to be found. Also, a photographer needed to be located to photograph the participants and a public space was required to house the people library event. Another hurdle was that there was a very limited budget for the project.</td>
<td>An exemption from planning permission was negotiated through collaborating with the City Planner at the fifth steering group meeting. It was agreed to classify the installation as a ‘temporary art work’ and therefore it would be exempted development under the planning development regulations. However, I had to send him a report highlighting the proposed locations of the posters. This was included in a formal application for exemption from planning permission. Property owners were negotiated with for permission to erect posters on their property. The local and often disused community centre was a suitable place to house the event. The management were very accommodating and allowed the event to be hosted there. Approximately 150 emails were sent looking for willing participants. The project network was used well for this task. 25 participants were identified and agreed to partake. A volunteer photographer was found via a call for help using twitter and the project network. DD:LL located money in their budget, a total of €1200 to print posters. There was no further money available for the erection of the posters, so I asked for favours from friends to help me complete this task. A disused and damaged ladder was supplied by the manager of the Markets Building and wallpaper paste, paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Path</td>
<td>Permission was needed from DCC for temporary road closure, for the release of parking spaces, for painting the street and for diverting the traffic. Health and safety considerations needed to be addressed. Permission was needed from the traders and property owners along the route. There was a limited budget for the project.</td>
<td>A meeting was set up with the DCC planner, the DCC roads engineer, the head of economic and development unit, the DCC cycling officer and the Deputy City Architect. They refused permission for all the requests because they had only 3 weeks' notice. A scaled down plan was made in negotiation and collaboration with the DD:LL steering group. Then permission was sought from the traders in the area. Materials were borrowed and supplied by the DCC parks department. However, the project still cost DD:LL €7,000. The expense was incurred due to the partial road closure and the safety measures that were needed, i.e. crash barriers along the route. It was paid to DCC by DD:LL. The original cost of the project was €14,000. However, the Creative Director negotiated that DCC would cover half the costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimp your Pavement</td>
<td>The project wanted to deal with the issue of ownership of the public realm and public realm improvement, therefore the project sought to provoke debate around this issue. Given this fact, permission to use the public footpath was not sought. This was done as a way of highlighting the ambiguity surrounding the issue of ownership of the public realm. The cost for planting was considered. Difficulties were encountered in finding willing project participants and collaborators.</td>
<td>It was decided that the project should appear like an obviously temporary intervention and planning permission was not sought. Money for planting was supplied by DD:LL. Maintaining 'the park' for 3 days had to be considered. After the park was vandalised on the first night of its realisation, a security guard was hired to mind the plants at night, thereafter. Collaborators were found via a gatekeeper, the manager of the local after-school club. Safety was a consideration because some of these collaborators were minors. This was dealt with by doing all the work in clear public view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting People</td>
<td>This project needed to find willing participants and to gain permission to project the film into public spaces.</td>
<td>Willing participants were found through the project network and the street conversations in the area. Permission was sought and granted from the property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Living</td>
<td>Permission was needed to use the empty but publicly owned stalls in the Markets building. Materials and equipment were needed. Volunteers to build the furniture were required. Health and Safety issues needed to be considered in relation to setting up the wood workshop.</td>
<td>Permission was sought from the manager of the DCC City Markets Building to use the building as a wood workshop. This necessitated carrying out a health and safety risk assessment. Permission to use the building was subsequently granted. Old and disused pallets were collect from the streets in the area. The project leader supplied his own woodwork tools. Seventeen willing participants were found through the project network, a twitter call, and through making a connection with a woodwork group in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity Network</td>
<td>Public space required in the working area to house the networking events. Participants needed to be located.</td>
<td>The local and often disused courthouse, Green Street Courthouse, was booked for the event. Participants were found via the project network and through the street conversations in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5 - *Love the City* prototype barriers and their resolution

### Conclusion 1 - Urban prototyping is a resource effective way of testing a proposal and more.

*Love the City* showed how urban prototyping could be used as an effective way of testing an idea using limited resources, for instance in the Golden Path prototype. However, it was also found to be useful in many other respects. Early stage prototyping was a good way of developing an idea. An initial reaction to a proposal can be garnered and thus it helped move the design process forward. It also expands the nature of the issue being addressed. It can be used as a way of engaging people in conversation about a particular proposal, and it can create a physical space for deliberation amongst diverse groups of people. It can be used as a clear way of communicating an idea to a wide audience. It can also contribute to creating a vital public realm.

### Conclusion 2 - Urban prototyping as a way of expanding upon city development policy.

Given that urban prototyping is a resource-effective tactic, it could be used as a method of exploring how to give form to the broad policy goals of the city development plan. It, therefore, offers a way to test different interpretations of principles of the development plan. This aspect of the method was noted by the City Architect:

> ‘...I think that there is a yawning gap in our own way of working and our own development plan, between policy and practice. Our own development plan is so aspirational, what is actually happening to deliver on this development plan? So, Designing Dublin and *Love the City* was actually about trying to put flesh on the bones on this idea that we have about creating a liveable city. What exactly is meant by that? And how do you do it in practice. Do you just say it and then it be so? No, that’s not how it works. You have to do stuff. It was great that the Designing Dublin project actually identified things.’ (Grehan, 2013)

### Conclusion 3 - Making physical interventions in the public realm is a grey area of operation.

Through working with *Love the City* I discovered that the practice of making physical interventions in the public realm is a grey area of operation, both legally and procedurally. The City Planner advised me to apply for an exemption from planning permission for the City Works prototype. Yet, the pop-up park, in the Pimp my Pavement prototype, proceeded without applying for an exemption from planning permission. In the follow-up interview with the City Planner, he notes that there is no official route for implementing physical urban prototypes. Rather, he suggests that there are multiple potential routes:

> ‘It’s fairly difficult. You know you have to decide if it needs planning permission or not. Or if it can be organised under that framework you were able to avail of. You don’t want everybody putting up clap trap all over the place, all over the city obviously........At the moment there is not

---

25 I lead the City Works project. Part of the project consisted of erecting large scale posters in the public realm. I applied to DCC for an exemption from planning permission and classified the posters as temporary artwork. Artwork which is exhibited in the public realm for no more than 14 days is exempt from planning permission.
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a recognisable route. Somebody might try and see anybody from the minister to the police, theoads authority or the planning department or whatever'. (Gleeson, 2013)

In Love the City it was found that having direct access to these high level civil servants was very useful
when implementing the prototypes. They facilitated gaining official exemption from planning permission
and they helped expedite the process. They offered advice and expertise in how to navigate the
bureaucracy.

Conclusion 4 – There is much scope for DCC to developing the way in which they are using the method
of urban prototyping.

Urban prototyping was found to be such a good idea that DCC have taken it on as part of their working
practice, as was noted in Section 5.5.2. They see it as a resource efficient, cost effective and transparent
way of operating. However, they are not utilising the method to its full potential. For instance, the
temporary pedestrianisation of Fade Street does not communicate that it is a trial. It looks like a finished
product and it is, therefore, being critiqued as such (McDonald, 2012). This was a missed opportunity to
garner feedback from the public. The same can be said of the temporary pedestrianisation of Clarendon
Street. Urban prototyping is an unusual practice for municipal authorities to adopt, and so the lessons
garnered from the experience might be invaluable to other cities. As was noted in a blog post on urban
hacking:

'The City of Dublin has found itself an innovative way of city-making in the 21st century, and
we're curious to see how this practice will develop in the coming years. The way the City adopts
urban interventionism and hacking principles and how it turns these into a planning tool can be
a valuable lesson for other cities.' (Pop Up City, 2013)

Therefore, these urban prototyping experiments need to be comprehensively documented.

6.4.2 Re-examining Tactic 2, DD:LL as a learning project and a city revitalisation
project

DD:LL offered people an opportunity to learn design thinking through addressing real-world, wicked
problems. In Chapter 1, I postulated that this aspect of the approach presented a win/win situation: the
participants or students learn a new skill and the city is potentially improved through this learning
process. However, through researching Love the City, I found this tactic to be problematic. I refer to two
episodes to illustrate this finding: 'Conflict 3, Learning versus Outcome' and 'Conflict 3a, Learning versus
Outcome Round 2'. These episodes are described in Section 4.9.2 and Section 4.9.5 respectively.

Observation 1 – The dual aims, to be both a learning and a city revitalisation initiative, caused conflict
amongst the design team.
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Both of the episodes mentioned above concern the way in which the Creative Director felt the imperative to take control of the design process in order to avoid having an unsuccessful output. In ‘Conflict 3’ she took control of the aesthetic and the implementation of the exhibition, 100 exciting things you did not know about the city centre. In ‘Conflict 3a’ she took control of the aesthetic and implementation of the Golden Path prototype. In both instances, the design team had expressed that they wanted more ownership of the output. They felt that if the primary goal of DD:LL was to present an opportunity to learn new skills, then there should have been an opportunity to fail and learn from the consequences. The Creative Director wanted to have successful outputs, an understandable goal given that the exhibition cost €5,000 and the Golden Path prototype €7,000. Presumably, she did not want to use public money on a subpar product. The steering group had expectations of Love the City and it was apparent that the Creative Director wanted to deliver on those expectations. However, it has to be acknowledged these episodes had a negative impact on some members of the design team. For instance, one person noted that she ‘felt like a bit of a tool’ when the Creative Director stepped in and ‘took control’ of her project.

Observation 2 – The Creative Director and the design team leaders never explicitly stated what they were hoping the design team would learn through their participation in DD:LL.

During week 9 of the project, tensions escalated amongst the design team when a group of four young architecture graduates came into the design studio to build furniture for the upcoming exhibition. They were contracted to do so by the Creative Director. They proceeded to design and construct some intricate furniture, in the design studio, out of cardboard. Some of the design team members displayed unease at this situation. They had joined the project because they wanted to learn how to ‘design’ and they felt they had not had an opportunity to do so. They did not consider the work that they had been doing up to that point, the brainstorming of ideas, the rapid prototyping, the street and scheduled conversations etc., to be design. They looked at the architects as people who were doing the ‘real design work’. DD:LL facilitated the learning of ‘design thinking’ and not ‘design crafting’ (These terms are discussed in Section 2.2). However, throughout Love the City, I observed that design theory was rarely referred to by the Creative Director and the design team leaders. This meant that it was not possible for them to be explicit about such things.

Conclusion 1 – Resource effective Tactic 2 is problematic.

It is concluded that when the primary focus of Love the City was on producing successful outputs, the learning aspect of the project was inhibited. Therefore, the concurrent aims, inherent in this resource effective tactic, proved to be incompatible. Further problems were caused by DD:LL failing to be explicit about what they were hoping the design team would learn. This was not to say that the design team members did not learn through their involvement in the project. Most agreed that overall, they found DD:LL to be a worthwhile and positive experience. However, the fact that they sporadically lost control of their work did affect their confidence, at least in the short term. So as part of a fair assessment of the
promising nature of the approach, the conflict and the negative consequences that this tactic induced, need to be acknowledged.

6.4.3 Re-examining Tactic 3, designing seed projects to meet local needs

The third resource effective tactic, designing seed projects to meet local needs, is now re-examined. The way in which this tactic was seen to have the potential to make effective use of existing resources is recapped. DD:LL aims to make improvements to the city based on the needs as identified in the study area. This means that, in theory, undesirable outcomes are avoided and, therefore, waste is eliminated. Once the need has been identified, the design team develop a seed project to address that need. The seed projects are not fully developed, but embody the potential to be developed by the group of people whose need they address. I found that this tactic had both conceptual and implementation difficulties. Despite the best intentions of the design team, none of the seed projects, which were developed through Love the City, continued to grow after the cessation of the project.

Observation 1 – Identifying the ‘need’ was problematic.

As already mentioned, the term ‘need’ is nebulous and was never defined in Love the City. Also, the wicked problem that was examined through Love the City, the deterioration of the city centre, was a very broad area of concern. Therefore, I found that creating prototype projects to address this very broad brief caused much confusion and raised many questions throughout the design process. During the first fourteen weeks of the project, we tried to unravel this wicked problem, through engaging with the multiple actors in multiple ways, as described in Section 6.2.1. The intention of the project was to identify the ‘citywide challenges’ that were hampering the vitality and vibrancy of the city. These challenges would then be addressed in a localised area. At the end of Stage A, and after fourteen weeks of reviewing and discussing the input from the multiple actors, a consensus was reached about what constituted the major challenges facing the city centre. They were as follows:

- Identity, communication and ownership
- Environment
- Moving around
- Safety and street hassles
- Expense

The problem with the above list is that it is also very broad and general, and, therefore, it is open to infinite interpretations. It was noted in Section 1.4.4, that where efforts are made to reach a consensus about a policy that tries to address multiple outcomes and issues, the results are often bland, broad goals that can be easily agreed upon by all stakeholders. This is certainly the case with the above list. It is very general and does not identify any explicit or tangible need.
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In the last twelve weeks of *Love the City*, the design process focused on revitalising a localised area of the city, the Markets Area. As a way of catalysing the design process at this stage and of getting to know the area, the design team carried out various site studies and interviewed approximately 270 people in the area using 'street conversations'. The findings of these studies were reviewed and we concluded that there were things that were deficient in the localised study area and these deficiencies prevented it from thriving. These included:

- Lack of knowing how the public services worked
- Lack of ease to start a new business
- Lack of fun and lightness
- Lack of vibrancy and diversity
- Lack of a sense of ownership
- Lack of facilities
- Lack of ease of navigation
- Lack of a sense of safety
- Lack of identity
- Lack of communication between people

Again, the problem with this list is that it is very broad and each item can be interpreted in multiple ways. The theme that I choose to tackle was a 'lack of knowing how the public services worked'. Due to the fact that it was such a broad theme, I unconsciously brought my own values, tastes and judgement to the design process. Therefore, the work, which I produced, was somewhat autobiographical. I addressed what I perceived to be the 'needs' of the area with my own imposed solution.

**Conclusion 1 – The needs based approach, employed in Love the City, inhibited authentic collaboration with city users.**

At the end of *Love the City*, eight prototype projects were developed and each of them addressed one of the broadly perceived deficiencies mentioned above. They also incorporated various different strands of thoughts, some of which came from early presentations from the 'inspiring speakers', some of which came from findings from street conversations, some of which came from consultation with the steering group and some of which came from the original 1200 ideas and examples which were produced. Therefore, it can be concluded that we aimed to address a deficiency in the area, using various sources of inspiration that were gathered through the entire design process. As noted in Section 2.4.2, Thorpe and Gamman argue that a 'needs' based can be dogmatic. They note that with such an approach the designer articulates what they consider to be a social need and they then address that perceived need with their design intervention. Therefore, the designer is more influential in the design process than the people who are in receipt of the design service. This was certainly the case in *Love the City* and at times it
frustrated some members of the design team. One team member noted how we had descended upon the localised study area, un-invited: 'We are not trying to help The Markets Area. These people are hosting our little design experiment. They never invited us here'. Therefore, I conclude that the needs based approach, that was employed in Love the City, did not facilitate authentic collaboration between the various stakeholders in the localised study area. Also, it should be noted the prototypes that tried to find 'project champions' to grow them after the cessation of the Love the City did not succeed in doing so. Thorpe and Gamman recommend using an assets based approach over a 'needs' based approach when operating in the realm of design for social good. This is where the designer works with the willing collaborators, leveraging existing resources to reach a collective goal. It is thus less dogmatic than a needs based approach.

6.4.4 Further findings regarding the effective use of resources in Love the City

Through researching Love the City, I found that the skills of the transdisciplinary team were not used to their full capacity. Given the wide variety of disciplinary backgrounds of the design team members, the project was afforded expertise in anthropology, architecture, architectural technology, behavioural change, business management, community development, computer science, digital media, electronic engineering, farming, fine art, furniture design, industrial design, interior design, local government studies, marketing, multimedia communications, sustainable development, sustainable transport, urban design and youth work. These existing skills were ineffectively incorporated into the design process. This is very clearly illustrated in 'Conflict 2 – Can inspiration be mined?' In this conflict, the design team member, who had a graduate degree in anthropology and significant experience in semi-structured interviewing, suggested that we find a more consistent and co-ordinated way of recording the findings from the street conversations. He was concerned about the information not being minable. Although armed with the most experience and knowledge in this area, his expertise was not valued over less qualified opinions and the Creative Director did not consult him about how to carry out this task. Instead of using this existing knowledge and expertise, we invented a new method for garnering information from the passerby in public space.

The reluctance of the Creative Director to use the existing knowledge of the design team members could be attributed to her determination to have a flat hierarchical arrangement amongst the design team. She insisted that all opinions were valuable and respected. Although this quality helped to create a safe and creative space for the project, it also threatened the quality of the output. It is also likely that the Creative Director was following the advice of Bruce Mau, her former employer. As noted in Chapter 2, he views the naivety of the designer, as the 'non-expert', as an asset and a source of creativity. This quality allows them to view the design situation with fresh eyes. Although the novice might offer a 'fresh insight' into an issue or a situation, there is also wisdom in referencing convention, established research methods and an existing base of knowledge.
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On completion of *Love the City*, a debriefing meeting was held with all members of the design team in attendance. In this session, various opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the project were offered. The majority of people felt that there had been an excessive amount of time spent on discussing issues. It was noted that sometimes the ‘check-in’ and ‘check-out’ sessions lasted up to forty minutes. The excessive discussion sessions were a consequence of valuing all opinions, both novice and expert, equally.

6.5 DID DD:LL BUILD INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR COLLABORATIVE CITY DEVELOPMENT?

Chapter 5 revealed that DD:LL contributed to building a certain amount of capacity within DCC for collaborative city development. The Studio, the DCC in-house innovation lab that was founded on foot of the pilot project, is very significant in this regard. It forms a stable base within the organisation, from which to carry out projects with the private and educational sectors. For instance, Dublinked, the project that opened up access to DCC data sets, was developed in collaboration with the other Dublin based local authorities, the National University of Ireland Maynooth, and IBM Research. The *existence* of The Studio also means that the organisation also has direct access to public consultation skills and these can be drawn on, as necessitated, by other departments in the organisation. The Studio also made possible the establishment of the post-graduate Masters in Design Practice with DIT. Similarly, they facilitated the Institute without Boundaries study of Dublin, through *The Dublin Project*. I also uncovered that the staff who partook in DD:LL developed a capacity for innovation. As the City Architect noted:

'It was wonderful to see how Dublin City Council people flourished in Designing Dublin, because they were free from the structures and the restraints that they would meet in here, which was essentially 'you can’t do that', not because you don’t know, or not because you don’t have a great idea or not because you’re not a talented person, it’s just, that’s not in your job description. So, by definition, Designing Dublin actually appealed to people in Dublin City Council, who had a more entrepreneurial streak and who, also, just wanted to do things and who found that they were maybe...were not always able to contribute as much as they would like to contribute purely, because it was not in their job description and if they did it, they would step on toes.' (Grehan, 2013)

Beta Projects is proof that DD:LL built a capacity for innovation amongst the seconded staff. It was a self-initiated project, born of one of the *Love the City* participants, who claims that it gave him the necessary skills to set up Beta Projects. I also found that through the influence of DD:LL, DCC have adopted the practice of prototyping ideas before investing in more costly implementation. For instance, they have created a new working group to create the new public realm strategy for the city. They are advancing this strategy through a process of trial and error, thus following the principles of prototyping as espoused by DD:LL. DCC have also adopted the idea of testing ideas for public realm improvement at full scale, in
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the public realm. The City Planner noted that, as a result of his exposure the DD:LL design process, he took a more human-centred approach when developing the strategy plan for the Docklands Strategic Develop Zone. I have summed up the various ways in which DD:LL has affected DCC in the diagram in Figure 54.
6.6 THE SCALABILITY OF DD:LL RECONSIDERED

In Section 1.9, I postulated that the approach used by DD:LL to collaboratively city development might be scalable to the entire city. This postulation is now re-considered in light of the in-depth study of Love the City.

Observation 1 – The provision of pro-bono work by the volunteers caused multiple issues.

At the end of Love the City, a review of the project was carried out with the design team. This meeting revealed that the volunteers had found being involved in the project to be a financial strain. Taking part required a significant amount of energy and time, therefore working in gainful employment, outside the hours of the project, was not an option. One team member stated, 'While I thought it was a great experience, I don’t know if I would do it again. If got some kind of accreditation for it, then that would make a difference.' Another team member pointed out that the application form had stipulated that there was neither a financial loss nor gain associated with participating. He noted that the experience had cost him money, because he had to provide his own transport, food, computer and other equipment for the prototype implementation. Therefore he claimed that, although there was no financial gain, there was a financial loss. I observed that the energies of the volunteers began to wane around week 18. Most of them had overestimated how long they could work without remuneration. One design team member had to leave the project, at this point, because she couldn’t afford to partake any longer. The fact that the volunteers were not remunerated also meant that it was difficult to manage the team. Poor punctuality of the design team members was a recurring problem for the Creative Director. Without an incentive to be present on time, it appeared that this issue was difficult to resolve.

It was not only the volunteers who provided their services in a pro-bono capacity. The entire project operated on huge amounts of goodwill. The budgets for the prototypes were very limited and many of the tasks associated with their implementation were completed as personal favours. This further added to the debt of the volunteers. For instance, I had to ask for favours from acquaintances to help erect the City Works posters and I felt personally obliged to provide them with subsistence for their time.

It should also be acknowledged that some of the volunteers were not partaking solely for altruistic reasons. They were in a very vulnerable position, living in a diminished economy with little opportunities for employment. Therefore, most of the participants saw it as an opportunity to develop their professional network, making contacts with high level city officials and a designer who had a good reputation globally. This meant that there was a power imbalance in the project. Some design team members did not want to express their discontent with the project for fear of appearing overly negative in front of, what they considered to be, potential employers.

However, I also observed instances where the provision of pro-bono work, by volunteers in Love the city, was not problematic. For example, when the Urban Living prototype was being realised, seventeen
people volunteered to help build street furniture. This demonstrates that many people are willing and happy to volunteer on a short term, temporary basis.

**Conclusion 1 – DD:LL is not a scalable strategy**

In light of having carried out this in-depth study of *Love the City*, I conclude that DD:LL, in its current conceptualisation, does not present a scalable approach for collaboratively developing the city. It relied much too heavily on the goodwill of volunteers and this is a finite resource. Nevertheless, DD:LL was a very significant experiment in an emerging area of design and lessons for future city design laboratories can be deducted from it.

### 6.7 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COLLABORATIVELY DEVELOPING DUBLIN

Developing Dublin in a collaborative manner, in line with the sustainable development agenda, is an intricate and involved undertaking. There are no simple formulas describing how this can be done. In Chapter 1, I postulated that DD:LL presented a potentially promising approach in this regard and, therefore, I carried out this in-depth study of it. As already mentioned, I found that, in its current conceptualisation, DD:LL did not present a scalable strategy. This finding, however, does not lead me to conclude that advancement of the nascent concept of city design laboratories should be abandoned altogether. DD:LL imparted many positive legacies to Dublin and the initiative built significant capacity, within DCC, for developing the city in a more collaborative manner. For these reasons, I believe that city design laboratories are worthy of further investment and development. However, there is much scope to improve how they function and their overall effectiveness. The DD:LL experiment has much to teach in this regard. Therefore, recommendations for future city design laboratories, which build on this case study and my research findings, are now offered.

This research also revealed that the practice of urban prototyping is not only a resource efficient way of testing a proposal to improve the city; it is also a powerful tool for facilitating collaborative city development. *Love the City* demonstrated that urban prototypes can aid in the democratisation of the city development process by communicating the intention and implications of a proposal in an open, transparent and readily comprehensible manner. They can act as a spectacle to lure people into conversation and as a prop to ignite debate about a proposal to improve a particular aspect of the city. Urban prototypes can create a physical setting for dialogue between random conglomerations of curious passersby. The practice of urban prototyping can be employed by any urban improvement practitioner, not only those operating from city design laboratories. Therefore, a separate set of recommendations, for developing this particular practice, is also given.
6.7.1 Recommendations for future city design laboratories

Ensure that the values and goals of the initiative are clearly defined.
Design is always a somewhat subjective activity that is shaped by the values of the designer. It is important that city design initiatives are explicit about what their values are so as to help structure the design process, reduce its complexity and align the activities of the various members of the design team. Having clear values can also allow for a more transparent decision making path and can help to avoid unnecessary disputes amongst the design team.

Make the goals of city design laboratories specific, modest and realisable.
In Love the City the goals were unattainable and this, eventually, diminished the spirit of the design team. Future city design laboratories should avoid having similar gargantuan goals. They should focus their efforts on improving a limited geographical area and their goals should be specific, modest and realisable. Also, if the goals are multiple, they should be clearly prioritised, so that the process of making difficult decisions is simplified.

Establish knowledge of sustainable development theory.
Sustainable development is a contested concept that is used as a guiding principle for improving cities. Future city design laboratories should interrogate how their values and goals relate to the progression of the sustainable development agenda. Therefore, having a working knowledge of the theory of sustainable development is essential.

Ensure that the management structure is clearly defined.
A transparent management structure, one where the roles and responsibilities of all members of the design team and of all project partners are clearly defined, is critical for the successful functioning of future city design laboratories. Disputes will arise when dealing with wicked problems. When this happens, it must be clear who has the power to make the final decisions in order to move the city revitalisation process forward.

Involve volunteers in a temporary and short term capacity only.
Love the City demonstrated how hinging the success of the project on the goodwill of volunteers is a risky tactic. It is unrealistic to expect people to devote themselves to a city revitalisation project in a full-time capacity. However, Love the City also demonstrated that people were happy and willing to volunteer if it was in a short term or temporary manner and future city design laboratories should use volunteers in this capacity only. Also, all volunteers should have their efforts duly recognised by both the city design laboratory and the local city authority.
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**Spend time building a network of supporters.**

*Love the City* demonstrated how the network of supporters was a valuable asset that was drawn upon to help implement urban prototypes. They also helped unearth ‘gatekeepers’ in the community and create a wider awareness of the work produced. Also, specific people in this network were sporadically tapped for explicit and essential knowledge throughout the design process. Future city design laboratories should invest time and energy building a similar network of supporters.

**Involve the ‘gatekeepers’ in the community in the design process.**

‘Gatekeepers’ are those pivotal people in the community who are tightly intertwined with making the local and informal social systems function. It is imperative that future city design laboratories seek out these people and invite them to participate in the design process, as early as possible. They tend to have pertinent local knowledge that can be critical for making any city improvement proposal a success.

**Consider carefully the size of the design team.**

The amount of people on the *Love the City* design team proved to be problematic, at times. Careful consideration ought to be given to the size of the design team in future city design laboratories.

**Throughout the design process reference evidence, as well as intuition.**

Many practicing designers employ an intuitive design process and, in carrying out research to progress this process, they tend to seek out inspiration rather than verifiable data. However, statistics and scientific studies also have potential to progress the design process and they are a critical for establishing well-founded proposals to improve the city.

**Be cautious of taking a ‘needs’ based approach.**

Designing to address a particular need is a nebulous task. ‘Need’ is a very broad and subjective term. It describes something that does not exist and, therefore, it is a construct of the person who defines it. *Love the City* took a needs based approach, in that they generated proposals to improve the city, based on what they considered was needed in the study area. Therefore, the design team imposed their views of what the particular need was. Future city design laboratories should avoid such a dogmatic approach and, instead, they should consider taking an ‘assets’ based approach, where existing and underutilised assets are leveraged and recombined so as to increase their value.

**Create ‘seed’ projects for willing project partners.**

If the intention of future city design laboratories is to create projects that will be developed by local project champions, it is recommended that they find willing project partners upfront. In this way, these partners can be involved in the design process, right for the moment of inception, and they can have their local knowledge and personal desires drive the design process. Such an authentic co-design
approach, where the designer works with rather than for the end user, should increase the chances of the project being adopted in the long term.

**Use established social science research methods to progress the design process.**

Designers often employ quasi social science methods when they are advancing a human-centred design process. They also have a tendency to invent new methods without having fully considered tried and tested methods. The social sciences have multiple, well established qualitative and quantitative research methods. Designers should reference these methods and consider using them before creating new ones.

**Maintain a coherent filing system.**

Future city design laboratories should adopt clear and efficient filing systems for both administrative and design development work. The wicked problems, which they deal with, are inherently complex and a coherent filing system is necessary when multiple different people are working on such intricate challenges simultaneously. There are existing and well established filing systems and these ought to be referenced before creating new filing systems.

**Take advantage of the location of the design studio.**

The location of the city design laboratory can benefit the design development process. If the laboratory is located within the study area, a network of supporters, from that area, can be casually established through the carrying out of day-to-day activities in that area. Also, a ground floor location, one which faces out onto a busy pedestrian street, would offer the potential to encouraging ad-hoc participation in the design process. For instance, a shop front might be used to display the work in progress and to invite people to get involved in the design process.

**Establish knowledge of and reference the theory of design methods.**

Multidisciplinary design teams should establish a working knowledge of the theory of design methods. Such knowledge helps heterogeneous design team members communicate with each other, about the design process, in a clear and efficient manner. It can also help structure the design process.

**Be willing to collaborate with others and communicate this message to as wide an audience as possible.**

Future city design laboratories should adopt an opportunistic attitude and should consider working with all willing collaborators. They should communicate this willingness through multiple channels: websites, posters, public presentations and social media.

**Establish partnerships with the local city authority and the local academic institutions, but maintain a sense of autonomy.**
Future city design laboratories should form a partnership with the local city authority, whose advice and input is essential for generating apt and workable solutions to city challenges. Having a good working relationship with them will help with the implementation of urban prototypes. They can provide pertinent advice and access to pivotal contacts, in the organisation, who can help navigate the opaque process of gaining permission to create urban prototypes. *Love the City* demonstrated that such a partnership, not only benefitted the initiative, but also helped DCC and the city itself. DCC, through their involvement with DD:LL, built internal capacity to develop the city in a more collaborative manner. They were also provided with an abundance of ideas to animate their own city development plan, ideas that had been tested through prototypes. Future city design laboratories should also consider partnering with academic institutions. This would allow the design team tap the organisations inherent expertise and incorporate this knowledge into the design process. It would also allow them call upon the student body for voluntary and short term input and support. Thus, such a partnership would have the potential to provide city design laboratories with access to a wealth of new ideas and a solid bed of knowledge. It is recommended that future city design laboratories should still maintain a certain amount of autonomy, so that they can continue to take risks and test new ways of improving the city. The City Architect, Ali Grehan, pointed out that the participants in *Love the City* were afforded freedom to experiment. This was reliant on DD:LL being an independent entity, free from the bureaucratic constraints associated with DCC.

### 6.7.2 Recommendations for developing the practice of urban prototyping

**Use the aesthetic of the intervention to encourage participation.**

It should be noted that there are certain qualities of the urban prototype that should be exploited so as to encourage people to consider the intervention and to participate in a dialogue about it. The aesthetic of the prototype should communicate that it is not a finished product. Rather, it should appear as a temporary intervention and a tentative plan. For instance, the ‘quick and dirty’ aesthetic of the *Love the City* prototypes encouraged people to participate in debate about the proposals.

**Invite feedback about the intervention through signage.**

Erect signage that communicates the intention and aims of the urban prototype, on or near the physical intervention. This signage should invite people to consider the proposal and to give feedback about it.

**Develop a clear application process for applying for permission to create urban prototypes.**

At present, DCC do not have an established procedure for allowing people to apply for permission to create urban prototypes. A formalised, clear and transparent application process needs to be created by DCC and other local authorities who wish to encourage this practice.
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Give further consideration to the health and safety implications associated with urban prototyping. The health and safety implications, associated with creating temporary and physical interventions in the city, require much further consideration.

Give further consideration to the relationship between urban prototypes and long term development of the city. The relationship between urban prototypes and the long term development of the city requires significant further consideration. If urban prototypes are to be seen as legitimate tests of more long term proposals to improve the city, then a legitimate way of evaluating urban prototypes needs to be established. Therefore, a systematic way of measuring the impact of and users' reaction to urban prototypes needs to be created.
7 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter concludes this thesis and outlines how the aims and objectives, as set out in Chapter 1, were met. The methodological limitations and the opportunities for further research are then highlighted. An acknowledgement of how the research contributes to knowledge concludes this chapter and this thesis.

7.2 THE RESEARCH AIMS
This research was driven by a commitment to the sustainable development agenda and was grounded in the physicality of Dublin. Given that enhancing public participation is considered to be an inherent element of the sustainable development, it is consistent that DCC are proposing to take a collaborative approach to reach their long term vision ‘to be one of the most sustainable, dynamic, and resourceful city regions in Europe’ (Dublin City Council, 2010, p. 10). Yet, there are currently limited established mechanisms for allowing people to participate in the development of Dublin. However, from September 2009 until June 2011, DCC supported an experimental city revitalisation initiative, Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn (DD:LL), and it presented a potentially promising approach for collaboratively designing the city. At the time of undertaking this research, there was limited documentation of this initiative and an academic study of it had not been carried out. The broad aim of this research was to develop an intimate understanding of DD:LL as a potential strategy for collaboratively developing Dublin.

7.3 MEETING THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES
The following six objectives were set out as a way of working towards the overarching goal of the research. A description of how each of these objectives was tackled is now given.

OBJECTIVE 1: To contextualise the DD:LL approach to collaborative city development through the examination of resonant literature and practices.
The first objective was met in Chapter 2 where I gave an account of the landscape of design theory and practice in which DD:LL can be situated. The work, design approach and design process of Bruce Mau was examined, as he explicitly influence the initiative. DD:LL was situated within the emerging field of design for social good. Human-centred design research methods were explored as similar methods were used in the DD:LL design process. Urban design approaches that, like DD:LL, use the strategy of creating small-scale interventions to catalyse large scale impact were noted. Also, examples of projects that closely resembled DD:LL were identified. It was concluded that DD:LL is part of a broad constellation of emergent design movements and urban design trends.

OBJECTIVE 2: To describe the project, Love the City, in detail.
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The second objective was met by giving a ‘thick description’ of Love the City in Chapter 4, based on having carried out six months of participant observation/design research on the project. This description was developed in tandem with the visualisation of Love the City, which offers another description of the project. This visualisation was presented in Chapter 6.

**OBJECTIVE 3: To uncover the legacies of DD:LL.**

The third objective was met in Chapter 5 through my uncovering of the various strands of legacies that DD:LL imparted. These legacies were discovered through having carried out three follow-up interviews with high level city officials and also through having carried out many more hours of industry ethnography, on a sporadic basis, for 2 years post completion of Love the City.

**OBJECTIVE 4: To examine if the various promising facets of the DD:LL approach were as promising as initially postulated. These facets included:**

- its inclusivity of a broad range of actors
- its employment of tactics to use resources effectively
- its aim to strengthen institutional capacity for collaborative city development

This fourth objective was dealt with in Chapter 6 where I revisited the above postulations in light of having carried out an in-depth study of Love the City. I found that Love the City was inclusive of an even more extensive range of actors than what might have been assumed from the examination of the pilot project, Finding the Hidden Potential of Place. However, despite it being inclusive of a diverse range of actors, the quality of the interactions with many of those actors was found to be lacking in some depth. I show that some of the tactics, which aimed to use resources effectively, were more useful than initially assumed, while others did not always lead to the best outcomes. For instance, urban prototyping was found to be both an effective use of resources and also an effective way of engaging people in city development. However, the way in which DD:LL sought to design seed projects to meet local needs was problematic in practice. Through carrying out follow-up interviews, I found that DD:LL did strengthen DCC’s capacity for collaborative city development and I highlight how they did this in Chapter 6.

**OBJECTIVE 5: To have analysed if the approach is scalable to the entire city.**

This fifth objective was fulfilled in Chapter 6, where I noted that, in its current conceptualisation, DD:LL is not scalable to the entire city. It relied too heavily on the goodwill of volunteers, which was found to be a limited resource. However, Love the City also demonstrated that volunteer support can be effectively harnesses on a short-term basis.

**OBJECTIVE 6: To make recommendations for future similar projects.**
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This final objective was fulfilled at the end of Chapter 6 where I draw on the strengths of DD:LL and my learning from the experience and offer a range of recommendations for future similar projects or city design laboratories.

7.4 LIMITATIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

7.4.1 Generalisation limitations

DD:LL occurred in a particular time and place and under particular circumstances. Many aspects of its realisation were atypical, such as the philanthropic funding, the generous support of DCC, the allocation of public resources and the high calibre of the volunteers on the design team. Its realisation was the result of the particular will, relentless drive and vision of D21C, its generous founders and its resourceful Creative Director. The support and vision of the City Manager was also critical to its implementation. DD:LL emerged from a wide range of unusual conditions and, therefore, broad generalisations which can be gleaned from it are limited. However, DD:LL supplies a very significant and sizeable experiment in an emerging field of design practice and much can be learned from it. The 'thick description' of it, which I presented in Chapter 4, allows future city design laboratories draw their own inferences from the experiment. Also, based my analysis of DD:LL and my learning from it, I can offer a set of recommendations for the development of future similar initiatives. My research also revealed that urban prototyping could be used as a tool to collaboratively develop the city and I also offer a set of recommendations for developing this practice.

7.4.2 Methodological limitations

I noted in Chapter 3 that I felt it was necessary to give my complete commitment to Love the City, in order to avoid adversely affecting its potential success and draining the enthusiasm in the design team. However, this strategy did cause me to 'go native' at times. I formed an emotional attachment to both the people associated with the initiative and to the project itself. In hindsight, I know that if I hadn't taken this stance I would have damaged the initiative. My being involved in an inauthentic manner would have been a drain on the group's energy. As a way of dealing with my personal attachment to the project, I constantly kept in mind that I was examining the initiative as a possible strategy for collaboratively developing Dublin and that I was not examining the people involved in the initiative. This strategy helped somewhat. However, I found that having regular meetings with my PhD supervisor and my research colleagues was critical to my keeping a somewhat objective view of the initiative. On reflection, I would have strictly limited my involvement in Love the City to the project's official working hours. At deadlines, I worked overtime and this reduced my time for reflection and increased my level of attachment to the project and the participants. If time had allowed, I think it would have been beneficial to carry out more follow-up interviews with more members of the steering group. I would have liked to
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have ascertained if these other steering group members had also adopted new working practices, as a result of their exposure to DD:LL.

7.5 FUTURE RESEARCH

The numerous ways in which this research could be developed now follows.

7.5.1 Longitudinal impact studies

It is too early assess the long-term impact of DD:LL. Due to the time constraints on this research, I was only able to identify the legacies of the initiative two years post completion of Love the City. Further legacies may emerge in time. Therefore, future research could involve carrying out another series of follow-up interviews, to ascertain if DD:LL had any long term impact on DCC and on Dublin. The full interview transcripts are included in Appendix 5, in anticipation of such future research.

7.5.2 Comparative case studies

Comparative case studies could be undertaken with other similar projects such as those highlighted in Section 2.8.

7.5.3 Further research into urban prototyping

It was shown that urban prototyping is a potentially a very useful tool for facilitating collaborative city development, but that it needs further research and development. Some recommendations for developing this practice are given in Section 6.7.

7.5.4 Diagramming and visualisation

The diagramming and visualisation methods that were used in this research, as a way of coming to terms with and describing the complexity of the project, could be used in future research of complex social phenomena. There is much scope to further develop this method.

7.6 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE RESEARCH

This research has made contributions to knowledge in four different ways. Given that there was no other academic researcher involved in the initiative, the first contribution is that it recorded Love the City for academic purposes. The second contribution is that it provided an independent evaluation of DD:LL, examining it as a strategy for collaboratively developing Dublin. Based on this evaluation, a set of recommendations for future city design laboratories is offered. The third contribution is that it placed DD:LL within a landscape of resonant design and urban design literature and practices. Finally, this
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research advanced the practice of collaborative city development through the identification urban prototyping as a tool for facilitating it. Through the work associated with both the DD:LL pilot project and Love the City, a method for trialling wicked urban problems was developed. I entitled it 'Urban Prototyping' and highlighted that it can also be used as a tool to facilitate the collaborative development of Dublin and other cities. Chapter 6 presented the various other advantages of this method and it also highlighted the difficulties associated with it, in practice. Thus, this research has contributed to the development of this method and offered a set of recommendations for its future development.
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The DD:LL ‘Welcome Pack’
Welcome Pack 13.09.10

LOVE THE TEAM

LOVE THE ACCESS

LOVE THE CITY

LOVE THE WORKING PRACTICE

LOVE THE ARCHIVING

LOVE THE DAY TO DAY

LOVE THE ONLINE

What needs to be archived? Everything!

When do I archive?

- Everyday: Whenever a body member, partner or client requires access to a document.
- Any time: When completing a task, writing up notes, etc.

Why do I archive?

- A record of all the work in Love the City is essential for the success of the project.
- Love is one key (private) Archiving.

LOVE THE ONLINE

An email address has been created for each of you. It is username@designingdublin.com. The password is your surname and year of birth. For example: Eimear-087 1214095

If you wish to change the password let Susan know. We recommend including this email through Gmail. If you already have a Gmail account or want to set one up, we will help you incorporate your design2i.com emails into it. If you don’t have a Gmail account or don’t want one, your emails can be accessed directly from the webmail server. The interface is a bit more basic than Gmail.

This will be the email account for all project correspondence. Please feel free to use it for personal emails also.

LOVE THE ARCHIVING

What needs to be archived? Everything!

When do I archive?

- Everyday: Whenever a body member, partner or client requires access to a document.
- Any time: When completing a task, writing up notes, etc.

Why do I archive?

- A record of all the work in Love the City is essential for the success of the project.
- Love is one key (private) Archiving.

LOVE THE ACCESS

We will be based in the Cultivate building from Monday 17th to Friday 21st. For Orientation, we will use the Omnidor Building, Ground Quay Upper, Dublin 7. That week, we will work in the offices beside North Quay and the Olden Quay. We will then consult with the members of the future.

Please use all images to keep an access to the public. Always engage with the public.

LOVE THE ARCHIVING

Digital Archiving is the public's responsibility in Love the City. It is not just the responsibility of the project.

Requirements:

- These files are to be placed in Drop box.
- Drop box is an application which will allow all the team to store, share and synchronize all of their documents without having to upload to a separate server or a hair drive.
- The Drop box will be placed in your personal Drop box.
- Drop box will place a box icon on your desktop. If there is a list of files, there is a list of files.
- Any time: When completing a task, writing up notes, etc.

LOVE THE ACCESS

The Omnidor building is open from 9am to 9pm. All the teams are based in the building, except the City, who are based in the City, and the City. The building is open from 9am to 9pm. All the teams are based in the building, except the City, who are based in the City. The building is open from 9am to 9pm.
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*Love the City* actors
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DD:LL project administrators:

- Vannesa Ahuactzin, DD:LL Creative Director and D21C employee, who has a graduate degree in architecture, a post-graduate design qualification from the Institute without Boundaries in design and who was a collaborator on *Massive Change* with Bruce Mau (Mau et al., 2005).
- Susan Butler, DD:LL Design Team Leader (DTL) and D21C employee, who holds a graduate degree in fashion design and a masters degree in multimedia systems.
- Brian Gough, DD:LL Design Team Leader and D21C employee, who holds a masters degree in brand development and who has many years of experience working as a graphic designer.
- Eimear Fitzsimons, DD:LL Design Team Leader and D21C employee, who has a graduate degree in product design and a masters degree in professional design practice.

The design team:

The seconded DCC staff:

- Paul Carson, who was seconded from the public libraries department of DCC where he worked for a number of years. He has a graduate degree in anthropology.
- John Conroy, who was seconded from the DCC Public Lighting Services department, where he worked as a foreman in the workshop since 1980. He has a graduate degree in local government studies and a graduate diploma in business management.
- Mary Mooney, who was seconded from the community development department of Ballymun Regeneration, a subsidiary of DCC. She had worked in various departments of DCC since 2000. She has a graduate diploma in community development and youth work.
- Ciaran Stanley, who was seconded from the DCC city architect’s department, where he worked as an architectural technician since 2008. He has a graduate degree in geomatics.
- Shane Waring, who was seconded from the city architect’s department. He had worked there since 2001, taking a sabbatical from 2006-2008. He has a graduate degree in architecture.

The volunteers

- Tara Wheelan, who has a graduate degree in Industrial Design and a masters degree in digital media. She also has experience working as an installation artist and a crystal designer.
- Linnea Vizard, who has a graduate degree in Industrial Design. She also has experience working as a furniture designer.
- Vincent Harris, who has a graduate degree in Fine Art. He also has experience working as a freelance artist and in marketing.
- Lindsay Rountree, who has a graduate degree in electronic engineering. He also has experience working as an electronic engineer and in third world development.
- Una McGrath, who has a graduate degree in furniture and interior design. She also has a graduate degree in International Marketing and languages and a post-graduate degree in Computer Science. She has experience working as a consultant in sustainable transport and...
behavioural change and she has also worked in IT and design education. She worked on the project in a half-time capacity.

- Micheal Rowsome, who has a graduate degree in Multimedia Communications. He also has experience working as a freelance artist.

The Steering Group

- Jean Byrne and Jim Dunne, founders of D21C, the not-for-profit organisation who created DD:LL
- Mary Conway, Senior Planner, DCC
- Ali Grehan, City Architect, DCC
- Dick Gleeson, City Planner, DCC
- Jim Keogan, Executive Manager, DCC
- Charlie Lowe, Dublin North Central Area Manager, DCC
- Lorna Maxwell, Senior Executive Officer, Economic Development Unit, DCC
- Michael O’Neill, Dublin South East Area Manager, DCC
- Michael Stubbs, Assistant City Manager, DCC
- Declan Wallace, Executive Manager, DCC

The Inspiring Speakers

- Trevor White, writer and social entrepreneur, founder of the magazine entitled ‘The Dubliner’ and creator of the initiative ‘City of 1000 Welcomes’ a project that matches tourists visiting Dublin with a Dubliner who is willing to take them out for a beverage.
- Nicky Gogan, founder of production company, ‘Stillfilms’ who created the documentary entitled ‘Pyjama Girls’ which follows the lives of youths living in the inner city.
- Jeannette Lowe, a photographer who photographs the lives of communities living in the inner city of Dublin.
- Killian Stokes, social entrepreneur and founder of ‘My Good Points’ a charity whereby one can donate money directly to a range of causes using mobile phone technology and thus dramatically reducing the administration fees.
- Ronan Harrington, social entrepreneur and founder of ARK (Random Acts of Kindness), a non-profit clothing company that promotes the carrying out of acts of altruism.
- Oliver Vander Elst, green entrepreneur and founder of Greenaer, a company that sources and sells low carbon vehicles.
- Peter O’Brien, social activist who negotiated the reclaiming of Dartmouth Square, Dublin 6. Prior to this the square had been closed off by the developer who claimed he bought it from DCC.
- Tobais Lau, an ethnographer and design strategist who founded Social Action, a sustainability and user-driven innovation consultancy who work with clients from the energy, agriculture and food sectors.
• Fergus McCabe, a medical doctor who works in a drug treatment centre in the inner city.
• Teresa Dilllon, an artist who maps the soundscapes of cities.
• Sam Bishop, a social activist and creator of 'Streetfeast' an annual day where communities hold a lunch party in a common space abutting their residences.
• Lauren Currie, service designer and founder of 'Snook' a service design company who works with public agencies in Scotland.
• Jim Dunne: founder of D21C, graphic designer and advisor to DCC on the branding of Dublin.
• Cllr. Emer Costell, the former Lord Mayor of Dublin
• Peter O’Gara and Ronan Dillon, founders of the design company ‘Me, You and Him’ who created temporary installations in the city that aimed to engender a greater sense of community.
• Ré Dubhaigh, service design and founder of ‘Radarstation’ a service design consultancy who works with public agencies in the UK.
• Paul Kerns, a senior planner in DCC and author of ‘Redrawing Dublin’, a book with explores contemporary urban development in Dublin.
• Mark O’Halloran, actor and writer and creator of ‘Adam and Paul’, a film that follows the lives of two people who are homeless and living on the streets of Dublin.
• Anastasia Crickley, the head of Applied Social Studies, NUI Maynooth
• Micheal Rice, architect and founder of Bioarchitecture, an architecture firm which bases its work on sacred geometry, feng shui and holistic design principles.
• Niall O’Baoill, cultural co-ordinator of Fatima Groups United. He was previously and artist and activist who worked with the community of Fatima Mansions helping them to reimaging their community through various artistic and cultural activities.
• John Harrington, sustainable development consultant and founder of RealEyes, a sustainable development consultancy who advised DCC on how they could integrate the principles of the Natural Step into how their organisation operates.
• Neil McCabe – Firefighter who instigated and drove the conversion of the existing Killbarack fire station into a carbon neutral building.
• Damini Kumar – EU European Ambassador for Creativity and Innovation and Director of Design and Creativity, NUI Maynooth.
• Mary-Ann Harris, Bio-diversity Officer DCC

Project Advisors
• Adrienne Eacrett, expert in geographical information systems, gave demonstrations in how to use GIS software.
• Paul Natorp and Kirstin Birkeland, advisor and trainers in interview techniques
• Ronni Tino, advisor in using digital technologies in the urban public realm
• Lorraine O’Rahilly, advisor in learning styles and personal communication
Representatives from City Development Projects

- Peter Leonard, landscape architect DCC and Grafton Street Quarter Regeneration project manager. He had been a member of the pilot project design team.
- Mary Conway, senior planner DCC
- Geraldine Hickey from the Civic Trust and Tom Coffee from the Dublin City Business Association. Both of these actors were involved in writing a proposal for how the Markets Area (the area which was the focus of Stage B of Love the City) could be improved.

Volunteer Photographers

- Lydia Bigley
- Hazel Coonagh
- Amy Fitzgerald
- Patrick O’Conner
- Thea Tilley
- Stephen Mooney

‘The Architects’

- Martin Burzlaff
- Amy Fitzgerald
- Sarah McGuire
- Paul Flynn

Other Actors

- John O’Shea who is a disc jockey at the local city radio station, Near FM. He was aware of the work being carried out as part of Love the City and he contacted the Creative Director to see if they would be interested in doing a series of weekly, hourly shows, for a duration of eight weeks in total. The Designing Dublin Radio Show ensued.
- Luis Pedro who is a documentary film maker that contacted the Creative Director with a proposal to make a documentary about the project. From the beginning of February 2011 and for the remainder of the project, he spent most days filming the activities of the design process.
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The DD:LL 'Working Plan'
Designing Dublin:
Learning to Learn 2.0 –
Love the City

Produced by Vannesa Ahuactzin
On 06 09 10
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Overview of Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn

Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn is...
A Learning initiative
Mixing volunteers with Local Authority staff
Applying design processes and tools
Action-packed and solution-driven
Rigorous and iterative
About leadership and entrepreneurship
Real and transparent
Engaging citizens in conversation and participation
Using Dublin as a living laboratory

Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn (DD:LL) is a Design Twentyfirst Century project, supported by the Creative Dublin Alliance in partnership with the Dublin Regional Authority.

Between September and November 2009, Design Twentyfirst Century ran the first DD:LL project, themed as Finding the Hidden Potential of Place in Clongriffin, located in Dublin's North Fringe.

Given its success, Design Twentyfirst Century is now carrying out the second DD:LL project, themed as Love the City and based in Dublin's City Centre.

Between September 2010 and March 2011, a second team will carry out the task of discovering and proposing solutions to the challenges faced by the City Centre. The team will undergo 26 weeks of learning and will partake in three project stages:

A. Grow awareness of the city
B. Improve the destination experience
C. Make the city sticky
Quick glance – project stages

A. Grow awareness of the city

A1  
*Introducing Dublin*  
(Week 1 – 3, September 2010)

This phase will re-open and link the discovery portion of *Love the City*. The overall ambition will be engage the team in re-remembering, re-viewing, re-interpreting and re-loving the city. Through a multitude of conversations, presentations, research, photography and reflection, the team will absorb and reflect on Dublin’s character and playlist of activities, people and events until they reach their own individual and re-interpreted version of the city.

Product –  
• 100 examples  
• 100 ideas  
• Thematic design project - I love Dublin. This is a project I would love to bring to life...

A2  
*Interconnecting Dublin*  
(Week 4 – 10, October – November 2010)

This phase will engage the team in a series of conversations, workshops, games, talks, etc., with a diverse range of stakeholders / users, aimed at further understanding why people are not traveling into the City Centre. Two sides of the project will be explored: Why are people not coming to the City Centre? Why are people not leaving the City Centre?

Product –  
• 10 processes (recorded and visualized process results)  
• Design Week  
• Innovation Dublin  
• Big deliverable: One million urban offerings - how can we grow people’s love of Dublin by designing:  
  1. A set of strategies to draw people into the City  
  2. A digital / physical offering ‘space’ that shows and shares all of Dublin’s greatness and vibrancy
A3
Mapping assets / deficiencies
(Week 11 – 12, November – December 2010)

This phase will use the information extracted from A-2 Interconnecting Dublin to identify the working area. Using a set criteria and a sequence of questions / answers, the team will develop the mapping tool identified in the Discovery Phase to extract the challenges faced by the City Centre and then map the assets and deficiencies related to those challenges.

Product –
• Mapping tool
• Identified project working area

A4
Open studio
(Week 13, December 2010)

During this phase, the team will showcase the work that they have developed throughout the first half of Designing Dublin 2.0 – Love the City. An Open studio will be held in the project working area, as a first encounter with the local community and area.

Product –
• Open studio

B. Improve the destination experience

B1
Zoom to working area
(Week 15 – 16, January 2011)

During this phase, the team will hold conversations, workshops, open space interactions, etc. with the residents of the identified area. Through a series of processes, the team will work to define their prototype project.

Product –
• 5 processes
• Detailed mapping – discovery of area potential
• Ideation sketches
B2
Ideas transformation
(Week 17 – 22, January – February 2011)

Throughout this phase the team will develop and test ten ideas that have the potential to transform the working area. The prototypes of the ten ideas will follow a set criteria developed for the stage entitled, improving the destination experience.

Product –
• 10 ideas
• 10 designs
• 10 prototypes

C. Make the city sticky

C1
Visual blitz
(Week 23 – 26, March 2011)

In the final phase, the team will develop a communication tool, like a book, that captures the work developed during the Love the City project and which proposes further test models for other areas of the city center. They will also engage in a second Open studio to be held in the working area.

Product –
• Love the City 2.0 book or other communication platform
• Open studio
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Project deliverables

1. One million urban offerings
   How can we grow people's love for Dublin?

   Design a digital / physical space that acts like a market and offers a 360 perspective of
   everything that is happening in Dublin. The space should connect people, offer events,
   deals and insights, encourages new ideas, unites stakeholders, display the fresh and
   new and encourage people to rethink why they are not visiting the city centre.

2. Ten expandable ideas
   What ten ideas have the potential to enhance the working area?

   Sketch hundreds of ideas. Narrow them to ten. Transform them from ten ideas to ten
   designed, robust projects. Finally, test the ten designs via ten prototypes in the working
   area.

3. One infectious communication tool
   Can we develop a communication tool that can inspire and have the infectious power to
   engage people in transforming the city center?

   Design a communication tool that amasses all the knowledge discovered and tested
   throughout the project. Make it simple but sticky and tantalizing so that everyone can
   grab the tools developed and apply them towards making the city center a more diverse,
   vibrant, delightful and inspired place.
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Weekly schedule

A. Grow awareness of the city

A1
Introducing Dublin

Week 1 – Information soak
September 13th – 17th

Monday, September 13th

•Morning launch of Love the City
  9.30 - Welcome by Vannesa Ahuactzin
  9.35 - Project introductions
  10.00 - Project context by Jean Byrne and Jim Dunne
  10.10 - Project challenge by John Tierney
  10.20 - Project expectations by Michael Stubbs and Steering Group
  10.35 - Words of wisdom by DD:LL alumni
  10.45 - Words of wisdom by friends of Design 21C
  10.55 - Closure

•Review of Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn's working ethos
  (hand-out of DD:LL ethos and guidelines document)
•Introduction to working ethos of DD:LL blog
•Afternoon working session - presentations by Mary Conway and Peter Leonard regarding City Centre and Grafton Street projects
•Review of Love the City discovery phase
  (working binders, archived material, discovery book)

Tuesday – Friday, September 14th – 17th

•Daily presentations with focus on five areas of discovery:
  1. Storytelling of Dublin (Tuesday, September 14th)
  2. Entrepreneurship in Dublin (Wednesday, September 15th)
  3. Society in Dublin (Thursday, September 16th)
  4. Interactions with Dublin (Friday, September 17th)
  5. Spirit of Dublin (Monday, September 20th)

1. Storytelling of Dublin
   Nicky Gogan, Still Films
   Trevor White, City of a Thousand Welcome
   Jeanette Lowe, Photographer

Design Twentyfirst Century – Positive change through design thinking
2. *Entrepreneurship in Dublin*
Sean Coughlan, Social Entrepreneurs Ireland
Ronan Harrington, Ark
Olivier vander Elst, Greenaer

3. *Society in Dublin*
Tobias Lau, Social Action
Peter O’Brien, Dartmouth Square
Fergus McCabe, Doctor working in methadone clinic

4. *Interactions with Dublin*
Lauren Currie, Snook
Teresa Dillon, National Digital Research Centre
Sam Bishop, Street Feast

5. *Spirit of Dublin*
Emer Costello, Councillor
Maser, Street Artist
Jim Dunne, Design Twentyfirst Century

- Daily research will be carried out to gather 20 examples (local and international) and 20 ideas (personal sketches) based on the theme of the day. At the conclusion of the week (including Monday of week 2), each team member will have 100 examples and 100 ideas.

**Week 2 – Information reflection**
September 20th – 24th

**Monday, September 20th**
- Presentation of theme – 5. *Spirit of Dublin*
- Continuation of 100 examples and 100 ideas

**Tuesday – Wednesday, September 21st – 22nd**
- Wrap-up and printing of 100 examples and 100 ideas
- Posting of 100 examples and 100 ideas

**Thursday, September 23rd**
- Review and discussion of 100 examples, 100 ideas

**Friday, September 24th**
- Design project - I love Dublin. This is a project I would love to bring to life...
- Presentation of design project
- Conclusion of Information reflection
Week 3 – Getting to know Love the City
September 27th – October 1st

Monday, September 27th

- Presentations of Love the City project stages by DD:LL alumni and team leaders.
  - Stage 1 – Imaging City (Eimear Fitzsimons)
  - Stage 2 – Understanding City (Deirdre Ni Raghallaigh)
  - Stage 3 – Reviewing City (Sarah Scanell)
  - Stage 4 – Ideating City (Peter Leonard)
  - Stage 5 – Listening Group (Eimear Fitzsimons)
  - Stage 6 – Ten Challenges (Susan Butler)
  - Stage 6A – People City (Ken Sweeney)
  - Stage 7 – Project Matching (Brian Gough)
  - Stage 8 – Mapping City (Jeremy Wales and Susan Butler)

- Review of Love the City material – book, archive material, etc.

Tuesday – Wednesday September 28th – 29th

- Focus on Understanding City section of Love the City
- Review of city centre stakeholders and users
- Identification of missing research questions re: stakeholders and users
- Research and further identification of city centre stakeholders and users
- Getting to know the types of city centre stakeholders, users and the relationships between them
- Mapping and grouping of stakeholders and users

Thursday, September 30th

- Sharing time – what is a process?
- Process criteria
- Examples of processes used in DD:LL 1
- Prototype design - 10 processes for different types of city centre stakeholders and users (two people per team)
- Presentation and review of processes

Friday, October 1st

- Iteration of processes
- Compilation and recording of developed processes
- Conclusion of process design and stakeholder / user identification
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A2
Interconnecting Dublin

Week 4 – Love the City relationships
October 4th – 8th

Monday, October 4th
- Introduction to What is Dublin for?
- Understanding the types of processes produced by What is Dublin for? – successes and failures
- Review of processes and groupings (from week 3, ongoing)
- Individual feedback sessions

Tuesday, October 5th
- Gathering contact information for stakeholder / user processes
- Drafting and design of email invites
- Identification of venues, logistics
- Review of processes and groupings (from week 3, ongoing)
- Mentoring from Steering Group regarding stakeholders

Wednesday, October 6th
- Contacting stakeholders / users (ongoing)
- Review of processes and groupings (from week 3, ongoing)

Thursday – Friday, October 7th – 8th
- One group to focus on Reviewing City section from Love the City
- Gathering – initiatives, people, events, looking for, ideas, etc. discovered through the review of city centre stakeholders / users
- Understanding of relationships between everything that is happening in Dublin.
- Questioning how can we bring awareness to people about what is happening in city centre.
- Another group to focus on contacting stakeholders / users (ongoing)

Week 5 – Running processes
October 11th – 15th

Monday, Tuesday October 11th – 12th
- Prep for process week – 10 processes for a diverse range of stakeholders / users
- Contacting stakeholders / users (ongoing)
Wednesday – Friday, October 13\textsuperscript{th} – 15\textsuperscript{th}

• 10 processes lead and run by the team
• Recording of all processes
• Stitching together process findings

\textit{Week 6 – Analyzing / presenting processes}
\textit{October 16\textsuperscript{th} – 22\textsuperscript{nd}}

Monday – Tuesday, October 18\textsuperscript{th} – 19\textsuperscript{th}

• Review and analysis of process design
• Team discussion and reflection on learning
• Extraction of key findings from processes

Wednesday, Thursday October 20\textsuperscript{th} – 21\textsuperscript{st}

• Creation of discovery wall with findings
• Link to existing initiatives, events, etc gathered in week 4
• Prep for Steering Group presentation

Friday, October 22\textsuperscript{nd}

• \underline{Presentation to Steering Group G}

\textit{Week 7 – One million urban offerings}
\textit{October 25\textsuperscript{th} – 29\textsuperscript{th}}

Monday, October 25\textsuperscript{th}

• Holiday

Tuesday - Thursday October 26\textsuperscript{th} – 28\textsuperscript{th}

• \underline{Schematic design of One million urban offerings initiative: How can we grow people’s love of Dublin by designing:}
  1. A set of strategies to draw people into the City
  2. A digital / physical offering ‘space’ that shows and shares all of Dublin’s greatness and vibrancy
• Preparation for Design Week

Friday, October 29\textsuperscript{th}

• Final preparation for Design Week
Week 8 — Feeding - One million urban offerings
November 1st – 5th
Design Week (1st – 7th)

Monday, Tuesday November 1st – 2nd

• Continuation of One million urban offerings by all team
• Preparation for Design Week

Wednesday – Thursday, November 3rd – 4th

• Design Week proposal description:

  Looking for Love - searching for one million urban offerings
  Designing Dublin is looking to get to the nitty-gritty of what makes Dublin an exciting
  City. Do you have a friend who is working on a project that will have a positive impact
  on the city centre? Do you run fabulous events that not enough people have heard
  of? Can you share your all-time favorite Dublin story? We want to hear all about you
  and your love for Dublin.

  Look for the Designing Dublin team in your local library, in your favorite museum, in
  the park, in other Design Week events, we’ll be everywhere and we’ll be easy to spot
  with our bright cyan T-shirts! Talk, draw, sign and feed us your love for Dublin.

Friday, November 5th

• Analysis of Design Week experience
• Gathering of findings
• Posting of discoveries

Week 9 – Stage 2 - One million urban offerings
November 8th – 12th

Monday – Wednesday November 8th – 10th

• Continuation of One million urban offerings by all team
• Focus on strategies to draw people into the City Centre

Thursday, Friday November 11th – 12th

• Prep for Innovation Dublin week
Collaboratively Designing Dublin

Week 10 – Testing - One million urban offerings
November 15th – 19th
Innovation Dublin (10th – 21st)

Monday – Tuesday, November 15th – 16th
• Prep for Innovation Dublin week

Wednesday – Thursday, November 17th – 18th
• Testing – One million urban offerings
• Innovation Dublin proposal description:

Looking for Love - showing one million urban offerings
Designing Dublin wants to share, show, flash, and amaze you with everything that makes Dublin an exciting city.

Do you love the city center but fear for your safety, hate the parking expense and are disenchanted by the shopping selection? We’re trying out a beta ‘love the city space’ – a digital / physical space where you can experience and see the other side - a city centre that is full of stories and grit, people with projects, ideas, ambitions, deals and offerings.

Let us show you Dublin’s one million urban offerings!

• Steering Group meeting G

Friday, November 19th
• Review of learning
• Information gathering and findings from Innovation Dublin
• Posting of discoveries
A3  
Mapping assets / deficiencies

Week 11 – Mapping Assets / Deficiencies  
November 22nd – 26th

Monday, November 22nd
• Introduction to Mapping and GIS
• Review of week 5, findings from stakeholders / users and information regarding challenges faced by the city centre.
• Mapping topics – fed by biggest challenges
• Mapping prep for wandering the city on following day
• Individual feedback sessions

Tuesday – Thursday, November 23rd – 25th
• Understanding the City through mapping:
  Team 1 – GIS and mapping possibilities
  Team 2 – beta mapping – street by street information collection
• Criteria for mapping
• Testing mapping tool, producing mapping results

Friday, November 26th
• Review of findings collected through the mapping tool
• Review of mapping criteria
• Definition of working area

Week 12 – Our working area, defined!  
November 29th – December 3rd

Monday – Thursday, November 29th – December 2nd
• Continuation – definition of working area
• Prep for Steering Group meeting
• Open studio invitation

Friday, December 3rd
• Project working area defined and mapping tool testing completed
• Steering Group meeting
• Review and feedback of mapping process
• Recording of mapping tool development in week 11 and 12
A4
Open studio

Week 13 – Open studio
December 6th – 10th

Monday – Tuesday, December 6th – 7th
• Review of week 1 – 12 and upcoming week 14 – 26
• Identification of learning
• Group feedback
• Gathering of work developed week 1 – 12
• Open studio – invitations, display of information, etc
  Open studio could be held in the area selected

Wednesday – Thursday, December 8th – 9th
• Open studio – show and tell of work developed in the first half of the project

Friday, December 10th
• Review of Open studio
• Closure of first three months

Week 14 – Closure – part 1
December 13th – 15th

Monday – Wednesday, December 13th – 15th
• Archiving of information
• Tidy-up of space
• Individual feedback sessions
• General to do closure

Design Twentyfirst Century – Positive change through design thinking
B. Improve the destination experience

B1
Zoom to working area

**Week 15 – Extracting the potential of place**
*January 10th – 14th*

**Monday, January 10th**
- Welcome and review working plan for week 15 – 26
- Study of project working area, including site visit: G
  1. Who lives in the area?
  2. What resources are available?
  3. What existing initiatives / projects are being carried out in the area?
  4. How do we meet people?

**Tuesday – Wednesday, January 11th – 12th**
- Continued site visit and information gathering
- Identification of the singular project question
- Application of mapping tool methodology to working area, using the single question
- Invitation for local community to ‘Listening Evening’

**Thursday, January 13th**
- ‘Listening Evening’ – design 5 processes
- Coordination of inquiries from local community
- Continuation of discovery of area – mapping and people / initiatives

**Friday, January 14th**
- ‘Listening Evening’ preparation continues
- Wrap-up of learning and strategy for week 16

**Week 16 – Conversing community**
*January 17th – 21st*

**Monday – Wednesday, January 17th – 19th**
- Roll out of ‘Listening Evening’ – series of conversations with the local community

**Thursday – Friday, January 20th – 21st**
- Analysis and review of information gathered during the ‘Listening Evening’ series
- Further application of mapping tool with new findings
- Initial ideation of possible projects – related to living, movement and enterprise
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Week 17 – Ten Ideas
January 24th – 28th

Monday, January 24th

• Ideation continues

Tuesday – Wednesday, January 25th – 26th

• Sharing of ideas – all team
• Review of good / neutral / bad ideas – viability of best ideas

Thursday, January 27th

• Identification of ten most viable ideas
• Viability of ten selected ideas
• Connection to working area stakeholders and users
• Network link to ten selected ideas

Friday, January 28th

• Wrap-up of ten selected ideas
• Design of ten selected ideas begins

Week 18 – Ten Designs
January 31st – February 4th

Monday – Tuesday, January 31st – February 1st

• Design of ten selected ideas continues
• Detailing of idea roll-out, effect, user groups, space

Wednesday – Thursday, February 2nd – 3rd

• Transforming ten ideas into ten designs
• Detailing of roll-out of designs
• Building of initial prototypes / testing of ideas within group
• Invitation to possible partners
• Site visits re: early testing of prototypes
• Prep for Steering Group meeting

Friday, February 4th

• Steering Group meeting
• Prep of prototypes for week 19
**Week 19 — Ten prototypes**  
**February 7th — 11th**

**Monday, February 7th**
- **Overview of prototyping**
- Review of plan of action re: prototypes
- **On site testing of ten prototypes**

**Tuesday — Thursday, February 8th — 10th**
- On site testing of ten prototypes
- Iteration of ten prototypes
- Review of success / failure of ten prototypes

**Friday, February 11th**
- Second iteration of ten prototypes
- On site testing of ten prototypes
- Learning from on site testing

**Week 20 — Ten prototypes 2**  
**February 14th — 18th**

**Monday — Friday, February 14th — 18th**
- Continued iteration and testing of ten prototypes
- **Steering Group meeting**

**Week 21 — Ten prototypes 3**  
**February 21st — 25th**

**Monday — Friday, February 21st — 25th**
- Continued iteration and testing of ten prototypes

**Week 22 — Ten prototypes, wrap-up**  
**February 28th — March 4th**

**Monday — Friday, February 28th — March 4th**
- Wrap-up of ten prototypes
- Gathering of developed content
- Summary of successes / failures
- Recommendations for future prototypes in other areas of the city
- **Individual feedback sessions**
C. Make the city sticky

B3
Visual blitz

Week 23 – Communication tool
March 7th – 11th

Monday, March 7th
• Information collection of week 1 – 22
• Definition of best type of communication tool
  1. Likely a book
  2. Display, like an exhibition
• Schematic design of communication tool
• Distribution of work to team

Tuesday – Thursday, March 8th – March 10th
• Writing, layout design of communication tool
• Overall development of communication tool

Friday, March 11th
• Check-in and review of communication tool status

Week 24 – Communication tool - 2
March 14th – 18th

Monday – Friday, March 14th – March 18th
• Writing, layout design of communication tool

Week 25 – Communication tool - 3
March 21st – 25th

Monday – Wednesday, March 21st – March 23rd
• Writing, layout design of communication tool
• Prep for Open studio

Thursday – Friday, March 24th – March 25th
• Prep for Open studio
• Steering Group meeting
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Week 26 – Visual blitz
March 28th – 31st

Monday – Tuesday, March 28th – March 29th
• Open studio – show and tell of all work developed

Wednesday – Thursday, March 30th – March 31st
• Individual feedback sessions
• Project closure
• Archiving of information
• Celebration
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Follow-up semi structured interview consent forms
Letter of Consent

Dear Mr. Gleeson,

Thank you for agreeing to allow me to interview you as part of my PhD research. I would appreciate if you could sign this consent form to confirm that you understand the following:

• The interview will be recorded using a digital dictation machine
• The interview will be transcribed by the researcher, Nuala Flood
• The interview recording will be destroyed once the project has been completed and the thesis written and finalized
• The transcript of the interview will be forwarded to you for approval and can be updated or edited at your discretion
• The final transcript may form an appendix to the thesis report
• Direct quotes from the interviews shall be used in the thesis report and may be used in academic journal papers or in academic conferences
• All care will be taken to ensure that quotes or excerpts from the interviews reflect the intention and concerns of the interviewee
• The recordings gathered during these interviews will not be released to any other party at any stage

I, the undersigned, understand the conditions listed above and on that basis agree to be interviewed by Nuala Flood for the purposes of her PhD research.

Signed: ______________________

Date: _______________________

2013-11-24
Letter of Consent

Dear Ms. Grehan,

Thank you for agreeing to allow me to interview you as part of my PhD research. I would appreciate if you could sign this consent form to confirm that you understand the following:

• The interview will be recorded using a digital dictation machine
• The interview will be transcribed by the researcher, Nuala Flood
• The interview recording will be destroyed once the project has been completed and the thesis written and finalized
• The transcript of the interview will be forwarded to you for approval and can be updated or edited at your discretion
• The final transcript may form an appendix to the thesis report
• Direct quotes from the interviews shall be used in the thesis report and may be used in academic journal papers or in academic conferences
• All care will be taken to ensure that quotes or excerpts from the interviews reflect the intention and concerns of the interviewee
• The recordings gathered during these interviews will not be released to any other party at any stage

I, the undersigned, understand the conditions listed above and on that basis agree to be interviewed by Nuala Flood for the purposes of her PhD research.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 219
Letter of Consent

Dear Dr. Tierney,

Thank you for agreeing to allow me to interview you as part of my PhD research. I would appreciate if you could sign this consent form to confirm that you understand the following:

• The interview will be recorded using a digital dictation machine
• The interview will be transcribed by the researcher, Nuala Flood
• The interview recording will be destroyed once the project has been completed and the thesis written and finalized
• The transcript of the interview will be forwarded to you for approval and can be updated or edited at your discretion
• The final transcript may form an appendix to the thesis report
• Direct quotes from the interviews shall be used in the thesis report and may be used in academic journal papers or in academic conferences
• All care will be taken to ensure that quotes or excerpts from the interviews reflect the intention and concerns of the interviewee
• The recordings gathered during these interviews will not be released to any other party at any stage

I, the undersigned, understand the conditions listed above and on that basis agree to be interviewed by Nuala Flood for the purposes of her PhD research.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: 11/2/13
Appendix 5

Follow-up semi-structured interview transcripts
I ring the door bell at the entrance to the planning department. I am ushered into Dick Gleeson’s office by what appears to be the office manager. We sit at a meeting table, near the window which is overlooking the Liffey and the Quays. I explain the overall purpose of the interview and I give him the consent from to sign. I discuss that this is not an anonymous interview and that he is being interviewed for a particular reason and in his official capacity. I inform him that the conversation will be recorded and that he will have the opportunity to amend the transcript. I also acknowledge that the recording will be destroyed after the thesis is completed.

Me: It’s two years now since *Love the City* has been finished up and I would like to interview you in your official capacity as the City Planner to get your view on the initiative, because I know it would be very particular. So, just to start with some clarification issues, when you got involved in it in the first place what did you see as being the potential benefit of it to the organisation (DCC)?

Dick Gleeson: Of?

Me: Of being involved with Designing Dublin?

Dick Gleeson: Well, I suppose as a planner, I would have, maybe, held some unconventional views about what planning should be and planning is a broad church, and you get people who come from many different backgrounds and you get people who tend to want to stay in development management, handling planning applications, which is file by file, everything is contained within those covers, the pressure comes on a bit each week and they deal with it by Friday and then a new stream of pressure comes on. There tends to be a bit of conflict between that regulatory side of the profession and then you know, that forward thinking, more ambitious, more outward looking dimension. I would have always felt that I wanted to connect with the energy of the city so I always like to get out there, walk the streets and get involved in initiatives. Long before Designing Dublin came along I was always comfortable in getting involved with people, who either contacted Dublin City Council or myself, or I initiated things. So that, I suppose, Designing Dublin just seemed like a dream, that was this amazing initiative that was a kind of a gift to the city that you had this opportunity to combine people from different departments and different disciplines and these really talented people who wanted to contribute their time to the city and that the way of doing that was to give them space, let them go off and immerse themselves intensely over a short period, but just keeping in contact with us as well. And eh, you know I felt that that my vision for future planning would be one of collaboration where, I’ve used the term ‘collaborative urbanism’ for some
years, and really that means trying to find creative ways of drawing in the capacity of the citizen in various ways with what the local authority does. The local authority would have moved from a culture of being quite defensive, not putting the head above the parapet, service delivery to one where...those two term, those two words, 'collaborative and urbanism' are very powerful together, because urbanism means that you have to, ok acknowledge the background of disciplines, and so on, but then you cross a threshold and the you share something with other urbanists. It means you are free to worry about the total picture, but also to also focus on specifics. It's a very attractive notion of people working together, you know urbanism, because you can ask anybody for help and nobody is defensive about their particular profession or patch. There's just shared sense of exploring what it means to live in a holistic environment, where everything is connected. You know, I often say you are allowed to be fully neurotic and worry about everything. So when Designing Dublin came along, I thought it was a fantastic vehicle for exploring the holistic urban city, in a way that was very energetic, but that was also open minded, had a great sense of mission as well. I think that you often described yourself that you looked in the cracks, in divisions, in the interstitial areas, in the areas left over from one discipline to another, where nobody is looking after it. The routine local authority gets so embedded in a rigid deliver of service that it doesn't have the opportunity to stand back and see how could we retool this, reengineer this. And, you know, I really do think that planning may not be fit for purpose in its current form and that its going to have to embrace, innovative, you know, smart devices for collaborative working with the citizen. When you consider that we are in an economic downturn now for 4/5 years, there's are very few planning applications as we know it from 5 years ago and there's a need for a lot of temporary uses, start-ups and planning often finds itself not able to respond to that kind of energy. I think that there are an awful lot of people out there in the city who are doing things and who would like to contribute and somehow or another there isn't the framework to do it and a lot of activity becomes invisible as well, it is below the radar, and the local authority is not aware of it, not able to connect with it. So in a sense what Designing Dublin was doing was taking a part of the city and bringing a set of fresh eyes in a concerted way, but without the restriction of departmental management responsibility and all the culture of regulation. It was free to explore and to recommend.

Me: So did you see it as a potential framework for developing the city, or as something more experimental?

Dick Gleeson: I must say I saw it as experimental, because, perhaps when I became involved in the process, I was I more, I would have expected that it would have gone more mainstream and that it would have been more well received. But I did think that, and maybe it was a problem of communication, that people were very busy in various departments and doing their thing, but I felt that there was a sort of, I wouldn't call it cynicism, but a reluctance to embrace the philosophy and the spirit....

Me: Within the city or.....

Dick Gleeson: Within the extents of broad departments of Dublin City Council. I don’t think it was well known enough at various levels. You know, I think the driving energy of John Tierney was very important in setting it up and I think there was a follow through in setting ‘The Studio’ up, that has been really good
for the organisation, but somehow or another there hasn’t been the penetration, that I would have expected. I would still be involved continuously with connecting with all sorts of collaborative projects, from European projects to the recent work on our SDZ (strategic development zone) to the docklands and so on.....we got really, really involved in the consultation in the SDZ from last September over the period of the last six months. Maybe things like Designing Dublin give you the confidence to operate without a parachute. We went down there for eight mornings in a row, with a range of issue topics. Invited all the network through docklands, sometimes there was a reasonable turnout and sometimes there was a small turnout, sometimes a big turnout. We explored a whole range of issues and it certainly wasn’t a comfort zone and you don’t go down with a defensive mentality, you go down with an interest to find out what people think, what people want and how they see us working together. I think things like Designing Dublin would have influenced that need and confidence to explore areas that matter, but that we mightn’t have always the expertise to do it. We asked ourselves in the making of the SDZ: was the SDZ merely a clever vehicle for delivering fast planning permissions or was it about strategy and process? We said it had to be about strategy and process. It had to be about leadership. Who else would drive it except Dublin City Council who had made the plan and were responsible for implementing it? So we said that sustainability was absolutely at the heart of it, but we said that sustainability meant three things, it was the environmental, but it was also the economic, which it also very important down there, but also the social. So, we said how can we find ways of embedding process and strategy under those three strands? So, we are coming up with really interesting ideas about how we can do that, you know temporary buildings, or community building which will house, the responsibility, if you like, for driving a process on social sustainability. The energy was there 15 years ago with people like PJ Drudy and Trinity and so on, but it seems to have lapsed, we need to find new partners and stakeholders and bring them in. And like Designing Dublin does, you almost have to start from scratch, you have to go back to square one and ask what is it that we are trying to do here, or what are we missing? What might be a couple of fantastic initiatives that could really build the framework and capacity of this initiative?

Me: So, considering the potential that you saw in Designing Dublin, how do you think the reality lived up to that?

Well, first of all I don’t think you could have gotten more out of the people involved, they were exceptionally committed and maybe you know, I mean that was almost hard to respond to in a way. I mean here were these incredibly talented people, who worked you know a huge number of hours each day and were not satisfied until you know, they had really wrestled with the thing and you know with the material they were producing and so on. And in a sense then you know, you are questioning, how do you hand over that level of creative work and of expectation onto an organisation that is still in its everyday mode. So, maybe it’s unrealistic to expect that an organisation can actually absorb. It’s almost like they are getting, you know....it’s too much too food, it’s too much sustenance all coming at once. It’s a bit like where the practitioner tells you have to take so many milligrams of something, because if you take 10 times that it is just going to go through your system and you are going to lose it. It’s a question of assimilating all of that and, you know, that can be over time. There would have been a promising
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following on I thought. I mean you were out at the summer school in Belgium. I found that fantastic. And again, there is the idea of taking people and almost mixing in a refresher type of an immersion in the material and then asking them to do something. I found it just fantastic; I hadn't done anything like that in years. For six Irish people, to find themselves out in that strange environment in Belgium, or wherever the hell we were, I thought that was extraordinary, first of all. That couldn't have happened without Designing Dublin, it could not. Absolutely not! Then next follow on then was that we said that, we would link up with Institute without Boundaries as a city (Dublin). Now that raises this thing, what does collaboration mean? I think you know even going back to the Docklands, it has to involve collaboration with jobs and with economy and everything like that. And, that is not as tightened up as people think it is. People in the economic context, with its many different sectors, down in docklands are really interested in building bridges, you know, across other areas and so on, you know. Consultation has to be about economic, with sectors in the city, with bottom up communities, you know that's a different form. You did the Designing Dublin 1 out on the North Fringe, with a very bottom up approach, almost trying to find people, you didn't even know they were there, but when you found them they really did, it was meaningful to find people who wanted to talk to you and so on. But then you have the university collaboration. In a smart city how could you think, you know, all of the challenges facing the city, authority and region, wouldn't be embedded in the universities. You're going to have to find ways of aligning what the universities does with its research, with what the city is facing in terms of its challenges. Surely, that has got to be part of the answer of what a smart city it, for God sake. But then, there is this collaborative thing with other cities and other schools. Like what an amazing thing that IwB [Institute without Boundaries], this design school in Toronto, will link up with the city of Dublin for a whole year. That's a fantastic fall out from Designing Dublin and the kind of network and connections that the city was making at that time. And you know, they came in and it was decided, you know they had looked at, you know, whatever, a small community, they had looked at Markham, they had looked at a mining town in South America, but then they wanted to look at a city, of a certain scale so that they could begin to test and to look at its service delivery and so on. So the focus of the whole year became service delivery in the 21st century city and then you know, they tried to get a masters going in DIT, which is partly successful, in terms of the numbers, and then they came to Dublin for five weeks. They had charrettes. I can remember writing three pieces for three possible locations, I wanted the Dame Street out to Portobello one, but I wrote one for Thomas street and I wrote one for Dorset street, about what I thought of these areas and of how they came across to me. When I wrote the whole three, then I said well I don't care now, you know all three, any one of them would work, but it was decided on the Dame Street/Aungier Street one and that became the place where you explored all your service delivery and all your modules and so on. And some of our people went over for the crits in Toronto. Now that's real learning and exchange. It is just, because you know collaboration is one thing in terms of a theory and a high level philosophy, but there is lots of different layers to it, technical expertise is really, really difficult bit of the whole thing. You just can't do it in any old ramshackle way, you have to be organised. And you have to have input from people who know what needs to be done in certain places and you also need a
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culture that will support facilitation and that is one really amazingly....well it surprises me in a way that Dublin City Council couldn’t find a better way of funding these type of important initiatives. They are coming from left field, but they are absolutely critical in terms of what they can do for the city and for the organisation. I can remember saying to John Tierney at one stage, why don’t we put just one percent of our budget for innovation. Like of our 900 million budget, well it’s gone down now, but it would still give you 7 or 8 million a year and then you ask the government for a similar amount or whatever, to run programs, not all of them would have to be totally agreed before hand, but you could have your program for the next two or three years signposted, funded, the partners involved and so on. I don’t think we can go on indefinitely, expecting talented people to give up their time for three months and not get paid for it. There has to be some level of support for people in that situation. So I don’t think Dublin city has been creative enough in seeking innovative forms of funding that would give us more freedom.

Me: That is what happened in the end, there wasn’t a Designing Dublin 3.0 because of funding?
Dick Gleeson: Yea.

Me: And how many people are partaking in the masters in DIT?
Dick Gleeson: I think a small number. I don’t want to say how small.

Me: Is is one or two?
Dick Gleeson: Yea, it’s very small. And I think that was because it was a big fee and in the current climate people cannot afford six or seven grand a year to do something like this, which is almost a pilot MA in the first place.

Me: Just going back a little bit, when you say collaboration, could you just maybe say what you mean by that word, especially in relation to urbanism?

Dick Gleeson: Well I thought a bit about this, up and down, you know, well, my ideal way of looking at this for the future, would be where you are able to invite the citizen to co-create the city of the future. That is essentially what it means, it means something far beyond consultation, it’s not passive, it’s actually dynamic. It open, its energetic, its respectful and its essentially optimistic and hopeful. That you can you can actually think of a framework that would allow you to draw in the capacity of citizens and groups, to share in the management of the city and in dealing with issues and grabbing opportunities as they come along. And it’s at all scales and it’s in all sectors. It demands an agility of governance that we don’t have at the moment. Sometimes there appears to be a willingness to open up and do it in a particular way, but you find that there are statutory processes of one type or another. Like you look at the rigidity of city councillors and the way it is set up, the way they almost operate as, well it’s the board of governors, but they almost operate as the opposition.

Me: Ha, ha, ha,

Dick: Ha, ha, ha

Me: So, you know you have this strange split between councillors and executive and then you have all the city out there. So, I mean I remember there was an Erasmus university from Rotterdam, I think, it was a group who looked at entrepreneurial leadership, which probably wouldn’t be nicely regarded now as a word, because of what we have gone through, I think you know, almost pro-activity has become a
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dirty word and there is retrenchment and pulling in of horns and everything like that, I think they asked a question, who leads Dublin. And the answer was everybody and nobody. There can’t be that kind of loss of focus, the leadership has to be disciplined and well organised, and you got to be clear of your objectives and everything like that. And there has got to be non-negotiables, but that doesn’t mean that you can’t work in effective and creative ways with groups out there in the city.

Me: Just on the...when you mentioned the statutory framework or the legislative framework. What are the opportunities, as provided for under statute, for citizens to get involved in developing their city?

Dick Gleeson: Well, let’s put it like this. It probably doesn’t prevent you, but you might interpret it as maybe not giving you as much encouragement as is necessary. It probably centres around the work ‘consultation’, more than collaboration. I’d say loads of groups can work very hard and feel frustrated that ok they make a submission, but ok, the local authorities in Ireland just take it on board, or say they take it on board, or whatever. I would think that the public just doesn’t have enough access, like Designing Dublin was just an eye opener for everyone that was involved. I’d say for all the participants maybe, but for Dublin City Council people who came in contact with it and so on. I’m a member of the Academy of Urbanism and director as well and you know I used to tell the story, frequently, whenever I got the opportunity of what Designing Dublin was doing and of the other initiatives in Dublin. And people said you’ve got a really, really, live context over there in Dublin, it is really full of life, and full of energy and I wish that we had that type of thing. It almost seems to have emerged despite the institutional structure that’s here.

Me: So, I guess the official routes that I see where people can get involved are, submissions on the development plan, submission on local area plans, submissions on the SDZ....

Dick Gleeson: Yea, the display is there and people are invited to make submissions.

Me: Then the strategic policy committees and the county development boards, is there anything else?

Dick Gleeson: No, you’ve hit the main ones. The main statutory plans are the development plan, the LAP and the SDZ. Those are the only statutory ones, everything else is kinda like of a lower status and doesn’t have statutory support. You know a lot of things go on. I think there is huge scope. I’m involved in, I’m working with Mark Dyer, you know, I don’t know if you’ve found out about cost action, it’s called ‘People friendly cities in a data rich world’.

Me: Yea, I heard of that.

Dick Gleeson: That was again because we got to know each other and then Mark said well why don’t we have coffee, about half a dozen of us, and we sat down and had a nice slow conversation, there were a few silences, but we really put our finger on that European project through that discussion, sitting in the basement of TrinityHaus and there was the national rehabilitation board, Ger Craddock was there and that American woman, Mary Lee and Mark Bennet and myself and Mark Dyer and we really began to see that there was a gap somewhere in a lot of these European Projects, the documentation of learning wasn’t exploited or documented. Tracking the process of how people reacted to the various different initiatives. It’s kinda a bit like the question, like the question you are asking. What do we learn from these things, or what worked and what didn’t work? But part of that anyway, is to set up the city
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sounding board. I’ve wanted to build a research framework for the past year or two and I’ve already worked out a simple way of doing it on character areas. We made this map of character areas in the city about 15 years ago and that’s pretty well stayed, the likes of Trinity, Temple Bar, historic core, retail north and south. A lot of these areas are still kind of stuck in a rut. So the idea was to just bring four strands together. The first would be local stakeholders. The second would be people from different departments in Dublin City Council. The third would be people from some universities. And the fourth would be the city sounding board, critical city friends. Build up about 50 right. Use 10 or 12 at any one time for a workshop. And the workshops would be very simple and have a very simple agenda. The first would be what is our value system for this area, for this local area. That might be answered a and b. Value system in the way that the area appears at the moment and therefore, reflects a value system. On the basis of that then, you say what would be the long term shape of success, 10 or 20 years, natural step thinking. Then go back and say, ok, what are the blockages. And then that becomes the point of intervention for research and pilots and so on. So, you put a draft report on the basis of the first workshop and you bring it back to the second workshop, with more or less the same people and you say ok how can we take this forward? How do we think we could take this research framework forward, including pilots of one kind or another? They could be physical pilots going in, and then budget this, that and the other. So, like I don’t think I would have been able to put that together without having been exposed to the Designing Dublin thinking and process, I think the key thing would be you have to have a belief that the cake will rise.

Me: Yes, so it’s the optimism that....
Dick Gleeson: Yes, So you just know that if you’re in this leadership position, that you’ve been sitting in a local authority that has tended to be conservative, not be pushing the boat out, to actually find the group of people that I’ve been talking about and to sit them down in a room you have to believe that you are not going to fall flat on your face. And that the chemistry is going to produce something interesting. You don’t know what, that is the whole idea...

Me: Yea, Yea, yea
Dick Gleeson: What was the question? Ha, ha,
Me: Oh, let’s see, the question was about finding out what you thought about how the project went? More specifically, I guess I would like to know if you have seen any specific legacies in DCC in terms of how it operates? Obviously, you’ve already mentioned the thinking.
Dick Gleeson: Well, for those people who would have been open to that type of thinking there was affirmation. I’d have to say without a doubt, for people like myself, affirmation for continuing to do that and explore those kinds of things. There’s no doubt about that. You know, I was just sitting down this morning, we are working with UCD on a bigger project called TURAS, transition toward urban resilience and sustainability. We have to do a couple of difficult packages on that and I was suck down in An Board Pleanála with the oral hearing on Liberty Hall last summer and one of the meetings went ahead. They put in Pelletstown and this really annoyed me. Why Pelletstown for god’s sake? Anyway, got stuck in, but we don’t have to do Pelletstown alone, but we can also do that SDZ down in the docklands as part of that
collaborative thing, working with the local communities and that is what I want to do. But part of it, is kind of an ABC thing, and A is the literature review generally for each of the subplots and so I was like, literally filling them all in on Designing Dublin, IWB [Institute without Boundaries] and all of that thing. I mean what a rich tableaux from which to draw from, to begin to set up where you want to go with something like the SDZ in terms of collaboration. You know there's a linear push there that is the answer to your question. That is one definite thing. When we did the SDZ as well, we did all of this consultation we were telling you about, we did workshops etc, then we got the studio to do street conversations. Now, they had already done street conversations for the Grafton Street project and its become the way to do things. And John Conroy, led that down in the docklands. They got 500 people over a week. He had an organisational thing, that was just very welcome. If we had probably done that we wouldn't have categorised the stuff in the way he did. He was able to put his finger on seven different....he was able to write a lovely 40/50 page chapter, book on the street conversations, breaking it into seven different categories and also a really interesting series of maps, because he got everybody to put or draw on an empty map of docklands where they thought docklands was. So it was everything from a dot, to a circle extending to Heuston. And so he was able to map all that. There was a few other bits and pieces that he did as well.

Me: And how did that feed into your process then (for the making of the SDZ document).
Dick Gleeson: Well I used that material in all the presentations I did, down to the boards and the docklands council and then we brought it into the SDZ, because really it was our only link to the local community. He got people to write a quote as well and hold it up in from of them, real designing Dublin stuff. So not only had you got real people, throughout the text, you had them holding up quotes as well.
Me: Do you feel that helped you empathise, or how do you think that mechanism worked?
Dick Gleeson: Empathise with?
Me: With the people who live in the area
Dick Gleeson: Oh, yea, I got a huge level of exposure down there.
Me: Through this process John did.
Dick Gleeson: Through this and through the other like... you know, I just nearly went native down there for a while.
Me: Ha, ha.
Dick Gleeson: I literally was on my bike everyday going down to Docklands. And I got fond of the routine almost. I could sense their hostility towards me representing Dublin City Council. Taking over Docklands, taking away what they had, giving them......time of change...if you don't know that is going to happen to you, you get scared. Do you know they began to....the first sign I saw that they began to accept me, was they begin to joke and make fun of me, a little bit.
Me: Ha, ha.
Dick Gleeson: So it was really enjoyable, there is that line you have to cross for decent collaboration. You can't be just going in a holding back. You can't be cynical about it and just go through the motions, here and you can have your say then we are going to go off and do our own thing anyway. It is tormenting to
go native. I suppose 'to go native' is really a term to describe the mental state you should get into. If you leave your institution and you go into this area you almost have to divest yourself a bit of where you are coming from and you really have to run with the issues and see how you can. It like, I was kind of delighted when I found, the three strand to sustainability thing, as a way of communicating the gap of the bridge between, the economic and the social community and that was a way of bridging the three.

Me: Could you just explain that a little bit?

Dick Gleeson: Well, em, we had these high level themes and there were 12 of them and they were things like maritime, historic legacy, the economic, the social regen, the physical quality of public space, all of these things, you couldn't really knock one word out. So we said, here we are taking over from Docklands, you know, they've had great successes, but they have had some difficulties also and that means that they are hiding some difficult aspects of sustainability that were not being addressed. So we really had to, we said that we had this once off opportunity, to actually really open up. So you know. I said, I did... I remember I did four slides and I said this is what is going to happen to you if you are not sustainable. This is what is going to happen to you if you make a mess of the economic platform you have. This is what is going to happen to you. I did five negative slides, just to frighten them you know. Ha, ha... And to make them realise that there is a big responsibility and challenge here. Then we said sustainability is at the heart of everything and then we have these three strands and then we said ok what does environmental sustainability mean and there was a box there with it mean the whole business about building construction using the right materials, energy, dealing with flooding, dealing with sustainable urban systems. You know all that type of stuff is relatively well understood, although not terribly well implemented in Ireland at the moment. Then we said economic sustainability, what does that mean, we said that means looking after all the sectors down here. We have the big guys coming in, with the big floor plates. They want to come to Dublin, because Dublin is interesting and then they want to close down, they want to create a gated community. We are saying you need to have big firms, small firms, medium sized firms, you need the kind of buildings that can accommodate seedling firms, and they want to go into, the creative ones want to go into warehouses where the rents are lower, in any case to create synergy. It means trying to find a tracking system, to understand these factors and how they are relating to each other. Like we found surprising things down in Docklands, Islamic services is developing. 70% of the world's commercial aircraft are leased from Docklands. There is a transferability of services from the aviation industry down there to marine services, which is beginning to open up. The same legal, financial, digital services are there. So you know, we began to do maps, I'll just show you one map, it's just a lovely map I think, and there was a lot of really good positive response to this map. (Dick Gleeson flicks through a document on the table looking for the map he wants to show me.) It's a simple map.....(flick pages). You have the big concentrations of the financial here, Spenser Dock (pointing to map) and the IFSC 1 and 2. Then you have the creative stuff, digital emerging out of around Barrow Street and so on and the legal people have also relocated and are consolidating. So, you know I showed that to CEO's down there at an early morning breakfast meeting and they found it great, God they said
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‘that’s a fantastic map’. So you are talking about an economic ecology down there. Innovation, you know if you’re not sponsoring innovation, then this place will not be there in 10 years.

Me: And supporting it and encouraging it?

Dick Gleeson: Yea, so you know places like this as well....most places would give their eye teeth to have a university on their doorstep, like trinity. So, what is the leverage going on between Trinity and this down here? You know.

Me: I guess the Trinity building is in there, (me pointing at map)

Dick Gleeson; Yea, it is, it’s part of the answer. You know then social, you are trying to generate process, you are trying to generate collaborations, and you know you are saying. The SDZ is a spatial document, with three dimensional this that and the other, but you know, you got to find ways of energising the involvement of stakeholders, through implementation.

Me: Hmm, yea...

Dick Gleeson: What we are saying is that this will be sterilised with DART underground. That’s open cast mining there, whereas that is not, that is where the tunnel comes in here and that’s open cast. So we said here, nothing is going to happen on that for 7 or 8 years. So we are saying. We’re proposing in this document that this site be used for a temporary three storey, four storey building. Was I saying that earlier on?

Me: No, no.

Dick Gleeson: Where you will get economic Docklands, you go in the door of this place, it’ll have small firms, it’ll have tracking systems for all the clusters, you will be able to see, you know, IDA will walk in that door and you will just get economic docklands. It’ll be part marketing, part research, part innovation. It’s a temporary building, built up of a series of cartridges, demountable, green roof and we will chop out a corner for a little south facing cafe and so on. That’s an example of taking a problem and suggesting a solution, that government I hope will not be able to resist. And those demountable buildings could be used anywhere else in the city. For the social there is this long standing hope for a community building down here. Now it was between five and ten storeys, as you look down from this square there is a beautiful view of these buildings along here, you know these nineteen thirty’s buildings, and we are saying we really want something here of only about three or four storeys, a little bit of commercial in it and hold the graving docks and that this would become the centre for driving social sustainability. That you have some form of, I haven’t found the word for it yet, it’s not an institute, it’s not laboratory, you know it becomes the place where you try and embed a centre for being critically involved with social sustainability in the docklands.

Me: And so you got all this information from your ‘going native’?

Dick Gleeson: Well partly. We had this team of just four or five people working in here and we were just meeting you know people all the time. We met a receiver that was working with NAMA and then NAMA heard about this Brady Shipman Martin group and others and then they encouraged all the receivers to meet us. So, that meant that we were in full knowledge of who owned what down there, because you couldn’t just be lumping a public facility on just one owner. It had to be equitable. So, but going down
there, and going native, I haven’t got the whole list of things that we did. But it is such a long, long list of involvement by us.

Me: So that is how your work has been influenced by Designing Dublin.
Dick Gleeson: Yea, yea, absolutely.
Me: That is a fantastic kind of legacy to have left. I just wanted to ask you a little bit about this idea of prototyping in public spaces. What do you think of that?
Dick Gleeson: I think it is the way forward. We have just done the public realm strategy and I think again, it represents a kind of agility that something like public realm strategy should have. We have been too fond in the past of making an over elaborate completed document, which is costly to product and then impossible to implement, because it includes so much. So what we have now is a document that is always going to be in Beta and it is a two year document and it will be reviewed every year and it has eight or nine or ten programs. Sometimes it's our responsibility for some of those, but others it's collaborative, like in the case of Grangegorman, the public realm up there. Em, so, you know, I think there is an element of acknowledging research, the importance of research, em, it acknowledges what we have learned from other cities. For me the best example is Copenhagen and what it has done with public space. They have moved away from comprehensive implementation of schemes to where they go in and try out a small section of something in the street and then find out if the public like it. It s a much better way of finding out if you’ve got the basic principle right. I see it as being a very useful, budget conscious and transparent way of working. I thought it was unfortunate that I think Frank McDonald had a few reviews of bits and pieces in relation to public space. You know, we were obviously trying to produce this public realm strategy for a few years. It was very interdepartmental and a group was set up in here and I thought it was a really good news story. And there was, bloody well, no decent public reaction to that level of effort. And then we got rubbish for doing the street off up George’s Street, what do you call it?
Me: Fade Street?
Dick Gleeson: Fade Street yea.
Me: Did you?
Dick Gleeson: Yea, rubbish by Frank McDonald.
Me: Why what did he say?
Dick Gleeson: He was just giving out about clutter. The quality of it was not good...
Me: And what I wonder has he said about Clarendon Street?
Dick Gleeson: I don't know if he has commented on Clarendon Street. But either way, you know....at the same time as he was rubbishing Fade Street he was really looking to Lyon (France) as the way to do things. You know and talking about the quality of the public realm in Lyon. You know, I can recall O'Connell Street, when we did that and it is still a good model, it was almost €700 per square meter by the time we finished that project, to include the cost of all street furniture, lighting planting everything. You know, I wouldn't be surprised if the cost in Lyon was twice that and eh, you know here we are a local authority strapped for cash, doing our best to try and achieve a good public domain for the city, wanting
Collaboratively Designing Dublin

to be involved with people, wanting people to response, trying out a project on Fade Street, that was incredibly well received by everybody, afterwards. And then you get rubbished.

Me: How much was Fade Street per square meter?

Dick Gleeson: I couldn’t, I might be able to find out for you, but it would be just so, so little in comparison with that figure I gave you.

Me: I think the only thing with Fade Street is that...well two things really...perhaps it is too permanent, the perhaps it is too nice, people are confused and they don’t know that it’s a temporary kind of experiment. That is why I think that Clarendon Street is potentially a more interesting approach, because people know that it is temporary. But one thing that they do in Copenhagen that I am not seeing being done here yet and that it is communicating what it is that is happening. I know that I have been on Fade Street with architects and they have criticized at the detailing and then I tell them, ‘that’s because it’s temporary’. There should be a really big plaque communicating what it is.

Dick Gleeson: That is a really good point Nuala.

Me: That is what Jan Gehl would do. He would have a big plaque describing what is happening and then saying ‘you can give feedback on this’. So again, it is rallying that kind of community spirit and heightening a sense of ownership of the public realm. And maybe on Clarendon Street, as well, it is perhaps a missed opportunity not to have communicated what the project is on the ground. It could have been communicated ‘this is a temporary project, tell us what you think’.

Dick Gleeson: You are probably right about the confusion bit. It probably is a bit too good almost for a temporary. There has been some adverse reaction to Clarendon Street, that it is not good enough, even for temporary.

Me: Ah

Dick Gleeson: Yea,

Me: Well that’s good in a way. I don’t know if you’ve come across Chantel Mouffe, who talks about democracy and how to deepen it. She is not promoting polite participatory democracy, because maybe it’s too idealistic in its ideology and maybe what we really need is and what you really want is, for people to start arguing, because that is where you get the passion mobilised and if they are starting arguments it might be a good thing. I think it would be great if in the future you had better communication of the nature of the temporary projects.

Dick Gleeson: Yea, that’s a good point.

Me: Say if I wanted to carry out some temporary installation, as an active citizen, how could I do that? Like, I guess I could do it as a temporary art project, like I did with CityWorks, it was an exempted development as an art project. That is how I got permission for it. But what if it was something more physical, something three dimensional? How could I test that idea as an activist?

Dick Gleeson: It’s fairly difficult. You know you have to decide if it needs planning permission or not. Or can it be organised under that framework you were able to avail of. You don’t want everybody putting up clap trap all over the place, all over the city obviously.

Me: Or do you? That’s the question.

233
Collaboratively Designing Dublin

Dick Gleeson: Well, I was talking to a guy yesterday, I just happened to run into him in a shop. He has a pub down in Niece and he just said that the police came round and they knew what his licensed area covered and he was eighteen inches out too far so they made him saw the ends off the tables.

Me: Ha, Ha

Dick Gleeson: And secondly, they can come in and they want your book of compliance in terms of regulation. So, you describe, it is like you are given half a minute to put your hands down and find it or to put your hands up and find it and then you put it on the counter and you stand back right, and then they start going through it. And they know that on page one is your licence for your pub and on page two is you know, covering your building, page twenty fire cert blah, blah, blah. They'll know what’s in page seven, what’s in page eleven, and they just flick through and if you haven’t got every single item organised in that you are closed. So, you know to have a city that looks coherent and is not a mess you just can’t have people doing their own thing all over the place you know.

Me: Yea, but there is a tension there. Who gets to try things out? And who gets to em, you know.

Dick Gleeson: But this city has been able to allow a guy called Fergal McCarthy to put his coloured houses floating down the river Liffey which has made the front of every newspaper in the world.

Me: Yea, that’s right

Dick Gleeson: He has managed to live on an island, you know, so you know I would say that you know, I’d say that when people are organising groups like Designing Dublin was, like there was obviously, they can get through doors easier and an audience to make a case for themselves. Like you take something as big as Contemporary Dublin or Dublin Contemporary on Earlsfort Terrace, you know we had to go through hoops to allow them to put up their big corner thing which was not really allowed on a protected structure, let’s say you know, but it was an absolutely wonderful thing, we lumped two months together, to allow them to cover whatever it was, August and September, because there was a limit of thirty days on what they were allowed to do under the exemption. So we just bent the rules a bit for what was such a huge thing. So professionally done, but with this series of things happening through the public domain in the city as well. So we had to go through each of those. So I would say we are reasonably responsive to groups and organisations and events trying to do things. We will do our best to make it work. So in terms of individuals then, it’s probably a different story. An individual doing it, do you know....

Me: But that is why the likes of Designing Dublin could have been a conduit for this kind of energy, you know. So its kind of like an intermediate body you know. Through the likes of even, Designing Dublin Out Loud, you know that one, where volunteers came in once a week and they got to try things out then, they got a bit of support. It would seem like a reasonable kind of negotiating space. Then you know you have the idea of a day when things are tried out, you know or a week of a festival, where things are tried out. I do agree that there has to be a certain amount of order or else there is anarchy. So it is about striking the balance between the two, but not just leaving the avenue open to the likes of talented artists, where they are the only people who can try out their thoughts in a kind of temporary way.

Dick Gleeson: I would agree with you. I think you are opening up an important area. Designing Dublin was a pilot and a prototype and there are many different shapes it could take in terms of influencing
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other events. You know when you think of something like Innovation Dublin, which is all about making visible the creativity of the city through existing projects and so on from many different sectors. Supposing you had a, something related to you know inventiveness in urbanism or something like that over a month in the city, you know where, you encourage people to do things or communities or whatever, that you know, this could be tried out in a pilot way in one year let’s say, if it was successful you could work on it for the following twelve months and get it semi, more controlled or regulated. Remember when we did the stuff, out on the street on Mary Street, that cost either six or seven or ten grand.....

Me: I think it was seven and a half.

Dick Gleeson: Something crazy for one day, just because roads had to go through a whole load of protocol, they couldn’t do it any other way.

Me: Yea, that was crazy money. So, potentially that was what Designing Dublin could have been, if it they had had a permanent home, whereby, these think and do tanks are given permanent homes throughout the city and link they are linked up with universities, where they get some kind of funding through universities and this funding might help people negotiate these kind of temporary things, in line with your plans and ordering them (the initiatives) so that they maybe happen in a day. So that in that way, it is a living city and you are encouraging that kind of thing, but there is not anarchy as well.

Dick Gleeson: I remember one of the Institute without Boundaries events, I went over to the presentation one Friday evening and it took hours and hours and hours I remember and one of them was where, they made a table or had a table made and it came along in a box and it came into a street in Portobello, and they just took the table out of its cardboard, and everything like that and made the table and just left it there. I don’t know whether they prompted some of the responses or not, but the next thing people just started coming over and having odd little events at the table over the next few days, like little picnics and things like that.

Me: But that stuff is fascinating, people love it and that it why we live in cities, it the kind of ad-hoc entertainment. But, I think something needs to happen to facilitate this kind of thing happening. There needs to be guidelines. If that is part of the Dublin that we want, that kind of living city with prototyping happening, I think that there needs to be some kind of facilitation. But essentially, if I had some kind of idea now, I would make an appointment with the planner to talk to him about it and that would be it, would it? Would that be how it would work?

Dick Gleeson: At the moment there is not a recognisable route. Somebody might try and see anybody from the minister to the police, the roads authority or the planning department or whatever. I think again, it gets back to that building a space where the culture is kind of understood and recognised as being necessary and a great thing to do. Dublin City Council went so far in terms of setting up Designing Dublin, that was a result of Jean and Jim very much, but you know, where is that space, that encourages that? Was that a blip? Or was it something we are likely to see as a permanent feature of Dublin City Council, that openness to setting up that kind of thing. I’d be inclined to think that was a blip.

Me: Really?
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Dick Gleeson: I'm afraid, yea, yea.
Me: Really?
Dick Gleeson: Yea!
Me: Ok.
Dick Gleeson: The circumstances at that time were good, you know. How do you drive that culture through various departments? In the planning department say, as I say too many planners just think its planning applications that they have to just handle. They don’t want to be upset. They just want to keep the head down and just do planning applications. That’s very regulatory minded and all the sets of regulations are there and they are getting more complicated as the years go by. And then I sometimes say to the odd one, well what’s the right answer?
Me: Ha, ha, ha,
Dick Gleeson: The right answer is when you go through all the regulations, ha, ha, ha...Then you know you the forward plan side and is a series of discrete projects, LAP’s and whatever, and people again sometimes take a ridiculously rigid approach to that. You do your issues paper, you do this...There is even a view in here that when you do your issues paper, you don’t tell people what you think. Now that is very heavily articulated at times, because you don’t want to be telling people what they should say. That’s the logic of this view point. And I said for God sake, you have to tell people what you think and let them tangle with it, or even be a bit provocative with it, or whatever.
Me: And the issues paper are....internal? What are they?
Dick Gleeson: No the issues paper go out for public. I mean I was reading the one for Heuston four, five, six weeks ago. It was so dull really.
Me: So, you don’t tell the public what you think because that might be too provocative.
Dick Gleeson: That might be...you might be accused of, of you know telling people what to say or what to think. You have to give people a chance to come fresh into something. So, in a situation where you have forward planning projects, is there an opportunity to build this other space? I’m always trying to do this myself, but it is not easy in the public service culture to build initiatives when you can’t always describe what they are and you can’t always describe what you want out of them. So you go along with them because you have a hunch that they are going to contribute to your thinking and help you solve various areas. I could give you many different examples of the SDZ that are sparking off different things. And I am trying to...I chair a thing called sustainable energy community and I’ve got them to sit in on top of the SDZ. I was saying to Mark (Dyer) there the other week, he was at this meeting. I was kind of making the case that I wanted the sustainable energy community to make a submission on the SDZ in relation to the sustainable design of buildings. So, I explained that could be very broad initially, saying this is a port land, it’s been recycled and is eminently sustainable, it has a good mixed use urban philosophy that’s sustainable, then you get down into the various areas, like quality of public domain, sustainable transport, walking and cycling and everything like that. Then you get down to the building and I said, I’m not technically adept to say what we should be demanding in terms of a compliance matrix on building construction and energy use. I couldn’t get them to get excited about this or feel they could make a
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proper recommendation. They start saying 'Oh you know, in Ireland we have BER that'll take us so far, but it's fairly poor, then do you either go for American LEED or British BREEM, like I want a series of recommendations from a set of professionals. You tell me what I should demand here, what is realistic to demand, you know. Well, there is a case where there should be a much better response to collaboration, but it's not happening, so I am going to kick them harder, you know.

Me: Well absolutely. Well isn't it amazing that, considering that Designing Dublin was so well supported by yourself and John Tierney and obviously, Jean and Jim put in a certain amount of their own money into it as well, that he is the head of the organisation and he couldn't leverage money, to see a third iteration of it. Isn't it crazy.

Dick Gleeson. It is crazy. I mean John Tierney had it within his hands to say I'm going to make a recommendation to the councillors that 1% of the budget is for innovation. Here I am, trying to promote smart city, innovation Dublin, you know prototyping city and all this. But he wouldn't do that. He choose to stay within the budget organisation, where there was no money for things like this, you made it up on the hoof. Now he was doing pretty well, grabbing money from here and there, for bits of things, but it was always off the back foot. It never gave you any comfort at all that you could build a program, you know. And like you even might say we did very well with Designing Dublin and the surprise is that we did Designing Dublin 2 and that's enough, because we need to think of something else now. That might be what he would say.

Me: Perhaps, I don't know I'd have to think about that one.

Dick Gleeson: There is a phrase that I sometimes hear down in Freiburg it's that em, it's a very simple phrase but I think it is a very powerful one. It's 'if something is part of the strategic answer, you know, you can't do without it.' So, you know, they organised their pricing system for renewable energies based on different prices for wind turbines. You got paid much less because they repay themselves over 10 years whereas photovoltaics are over about 80 years, so you give them much higher level of subvention. But they needed all the sources to feed into the grid and to make it all work. So, I think you know, in a completely different context, I think collaborative urbanism is part of the strategic answer and we are going to damage ourselves very badly if we don't develop it and give it scope and ventilate it more and more and more. And that means stepping out of the systems that we have in place at the moment. So, in a sense Designing Dublin prodded us and showed us how we might explore that territory of that particular strategic answer, but the culture still has to respond across a much broader spectrum.

Me: I guess the thing with Designing Dublin was that somebody organised it. Collaboration doesn't just happen. It has to be facilitated and it has to be very well organised. I mean, I've been involved in lots of collaborative experiments over the past five years, three very significant ones, 'Now What?', obviously TrinityHaus and Designing Dublin and the thing is, that in each of them somebody has to facilitate the collaboration. The thing was, in two out of the three of those initiatives mentioned above nobody was paid to facilitate, yet in Designing Dublin somebody was paid to facilitate, so that worked. That is the big difference, somebody has to be paid to do the tying together of everything, cause it just doesn't happen. There is this idea that collaboration, just grows organically, it doesn't. There has to be somebody making
Collaboratively Designing Dublin

the phone calls every day and it is not nice work......I’ve covered everything I think I’ve wanted to. Oh maybe, if there had been enough funding for a third iteration of Designing Dublin, what recommendations you have made to improve it?

Dick Gleeson: Well, I might maybe say that there has been a third iteration, with IwB [Institute without Boundaries]. And that has been a pretty logical direction to go in, to partner with another city another school and bring in their expertise. And there was a direct line back to Vannessa and Designing Dublin 1 and 2. So, em, next I don’t know, I think that one of the things you got to do, well at the moment we are dealing with citizens in a very atomised way. They are all spread everywhere, people just congregate in various groups, virtual and otherwise. One of my areas of real interest is area based stuff, you know, so for me then unlocking technical expertise, that example of us wanting to be able to be clear about what kind of building construction criteria we want to employ I think there is loads and loads of opportunities to look at character areas. And maybe that research thing I was talking about is just one example of something that you could do very easily. When you look at revealing the heritage and legacy of Aungier Street and so on, there is a character area, it is area based, you are trying to work with stakeholders, you are trying to document, you know there is the whole culture there of trying to bring an area back, and have it reach its potential. Work with various stakeholders and deal with funding and everything like that. So, I think that there is a, from IwB [Institute without Boundaries] and Aungier Street and everything like that, there’s a lot of scope for love bombing a character area, with all sorts of expertise, at all sort of different levels, different scales and different briefs. That I would see that, the city council is shrinking in its technical capacity. So we need, to be able to work right across the city.

Me: I guess, kind of related to that, do you have any opinions on the criticisms that are thrown at Big Society, where some people claim it is just a ploy to get the public to the job of the civil servant. How do you feel about that critique in relation to your idea of collaborative urbanism?

Dick Gleeson: I just have no patience with that viewpoint whatsoever.

Me: No?

Dick Gleeson: If you are a citizen you have a right and you should be involved and you should be contributing your expertise to the making of a better city. And I mean if you are to whip the public service and say you shall do more and reach better standards and better qualities and still meet the thousands of list of requirements. It is just not feasible or possible. Interdependence has to be the way forward. I think the public service produce a lot of high quality work and you know I think that is a very lazy stance on the part of the media to create that polarisation of public service versus citizens and so on.

Me: It is something to think about though. There is only so much people can do in a voluntary capacity for their community or their city. They still have to earn a living as well, so there is a limit to that (big society) strategy.

Dick Gleeson: Yea. I think expanding on what you just said. If you are just regulatory and reactive that is not enough. If you are living in an area, you’d like to think that there is some sense of holistic stewardship going on and that that is not just historical service delivery. But that it is thinking in a generous and creative way about the possibilities of areas and improving them and so on. That’s really
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where this collaborative thing comes in. It’s the engendering of that fuller sense of responding to the possibility of areas and that those areas are loved by the people are supposed to be looking after them. Me: In that way I think consultation needs to tap into the creativity of people, so it’s back to that idea of co-creation that you were talking about in the beginning. Collaboration is where the citizen is to co-create the city of the future.

Dick Gleeson: That’s right, I guess.

Me: Well, thank you for all your thoughts and input.
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Interview Ali Grehan

Date: 24th April 2013
Time: 12.00 midday
Location: City Architect’s Meeting Room, 4th Floor, Wood Quay, Dublin 8

The interview takes place in the meeting room in the city architect’s department. We sit at a large board room table. A panoramic window spans the length of the room and overlooks the river Liffey and the Quays below. I explain to Ali Grehan the overall purpose of the interview and I give her the consent form to sign. I discuss that this is not an anonymous interview and that she is being interviewed for a particular reason and in her official capacity, as she took a very active interest in the project. I inform her that the conversation will be recorded and that she will have the opportunity to amend the transcript. I also acknowledge that the recording will be destroyed after the thesis is completed.

I turn on the recorder.

Me: So, just to begin with I would like to clarify some issues. Could you explain to me please how and why you came to be involved in the project (Designing Dublin)?
Ali Grehan: Goodness, well just to start. My name is Ali Grehan and I’m the Dublin City Architect. The Designing Dublin project, if I recall, started in 2009. It is going back a bit and a lot of things have happened. We have had two iterations of Designing Dublin, you know, so it seemed certainly novel and the novelty was more that it was being done through Dublin City Council rather than it being particularly revolutionary in itself. In that... I suppose I’m not a long term local authority employee. I became City Architect in 2008. Previous to that I’d been with Ballymun regeneration for quite a while, since 1999. Now, there was an interlude where I went to Fingal for two years. So, in 2006 I joined Fingal County Council as a senior architect and that was actually my first taste of working for a local authority. I was there was there from 2006, sorry 2004 to 2006, and in 2006 I returned to Ballymun regeneration as the chief architect and in 2008 I was made City Architect and came to the city. So, sorry to being long winded about my CV, but previous to joining Ballymun Regeneration, which was an agency, a special purpose vehicle set up by Dublin City Council to do the regeneration of Ballymun, so it had its own terms of references and it involved people who were deployed from local authorities, but also people who were brought in on contract. I was brought in on contract. I wasn’t a local authority person. Previous to that, I’d worked with the light rail project office, doing the design of the first tram system, so I’d done that and again a multidisciplinary project team, mostly, some people deployed from permanent pensionable positions in Irish Rail, or whatever, but, by and large, a group of people who were there on contract from the private sector.
Me: Ok.
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Ali Grehan: And learning how to work together. So this whole idea of interdisciplinary collaboration and having to develop the rules as you go along, the rules of engagement, to learn how to work together kind of wasn’t new to me. So then, you come into a structure, a much more established structure. Fingal is different, it’s not really terrible complicated, Fingal is a relatively new local authority. It was established in 1994 and so, its eh, although you would have the usual departments that you find in local authorities, so you’ve the planning department and the housing department and the environments department, roads, traffic, all of that kind of thing, architects, eh, it was slightly more flexible, because it was smaller, and it was newer. Dublin City Council is a very old time organisation, goodness, it goes back to the Wide Streets Commissioners, its back to Georgian Dublin, the establishment of the corporation. So everybody, pretty much everybody, who spoke to me when I got the job of City Architect and before I joined the city council, they all said the same thing and it was all very well meaning and supportive and whatever, but it was just ‘wow, you are going to have to....it’s going to take you a few years to figure out, to learn about the organisation, it’s very long established and there are different departments and they all work in particular ways.’ And you know, people talk a lot about silos. And yea, I think we would be the first to admit or to acknowledge that we are a very hierarchical structure and with individual departments that have specific responsibilities. And yet, there’s only one city. And generally, the person, the citizen really doesn’t care whether the issue that’s affecting them is purely the responsibility of the housing department; therefore, roads and traffic don’t have any input. They don’t care about that. It’s almost infuriating for somebody who has a problem to be told, sorry you have written to the wrong department. I just have an issue about the city and you are the city, so can you just sort it out among yourselves. So, what I am saying is, Designing Dublin as a project and this whole idea of being brought, deployed from the public sector, Dublin City Council, and working with people from the general population, we’ll call it private sector, Dublin City Council, and working with people from the general population, well, I kind of had already worked like that on big specific projects, like the LUAS and Ballymun Regeneration. So it wasn’t a very revolutionary idea to me, but what was so wonderful about it was that it was happening in Dublin City Council and that it was being run through Dublin City Council and that it was an acknowledgement that we need to change how we work, if we are going to do the best job for the city rather than the best job for ourselves, because they are two different things. So, that was what was really great about it and the...I loved the way...it’s so wonderful to see the enthusiasm of all the people. It was wonderful to see how Dublin City Council people flourished in Designing Dublin, because they were free from the structures and the restraints that they would meet in here, which was essentially you can’t do that, not because you don’t know, or not because you don’t have a great idea or not because you’re not a talented person, it’s just you don’t, that’s not your job description. So, by definition, when Designing Dublin as a team did actually appeal to people in Dublin City Council, who had a more entrepreneurial streak and also, just wanted to do things. And found that they were maybe...were not always able to contribute as much as they would like to contribute purely, because it was not in their job description and if they did it, they would step on toes. 

Me: Yea, yea, yea, yip
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Ali Grehan: And that's actually...we can't afford that kind of behaviour or attitude to prevail, because it's getting in the way of delivering good services. So, that was what was so refreshing about Designing Dublin and then the idea that you would pilot projects. It's kind of, you know, a very gentle way of doing things. It's a very liberating way of doing things. Nobody was expecting those projects to become real in six months. So, you're gonna build a community centre in six months? That's obviously not going to happen. So, however, so it gave people permission to try out different things without the onus of having to deliver them. Now the criticism of that is do people then propose unrealistic things? Because if you do have to deliver something, well then you don't faff around proposing something that is completely unrealistic and aspirational. However, the down side of always being constrained by what's probably, is that you never dream of what's possible or of what should be. I think there are people who said that better than me, whatever, Martin Luther King, I'm sure said these kind of things, ha, ha, ha....

Me: ha, ha, ha, ha....

Ali Grehan: About what could be. There is a wonderful Chinese proverb that says: 'Vision without action is a daydream, action without vision is a nightmare.' And that's really...that's the meeting point between the two, the two working hand in hand, that ultimately delivers something inspirational and realistic. So, Designing Dublin was just a really great forum for people to experiment with ways of working together and it was nothing, it wasn't actually anything to do with the final projects. I never thought it would be anything to do with the final projects, I just thought it was to do with the people learning how to work together. I think that's what you guys said at the time. And, I suppose, I appreciate that and I understood it and I appreciated it because it is what matters. We talk a lot in the city about communications and the need to develop better communications, that's tosh. It's actually the need to develop proper relationships. And they are not the same thing. I can let you know what's happening, I can let you know what's happening till the cows come home, if we don't have a good working relationship, it doesn't matter, if I don't actually want you to input. Communication is a very cynical exercise. It's the same with consultation. The criticism with consultation is that you are going out and you are not really asking people what they think, you are just telling them what you are doing.

Me: Yea, yea, yea.

Ali Grehan: If that's what you are doing then fine, but just be honest about it. Don't raise false expectations. So, I don't think the issue is that we need better communication channels in Dublin City Council, I don't think that's it at all. We have so many communication channels it is almost exhausting. We spend all our time at meetings. We need to have proper working relationships.

Me: With each other?

Ali Grehan: Yea, with each other, that are mutually respectful and genuinely inclusive. One of the best em...so I just go back to my days with the RPA and the LUAS and Ballymun Regeneration that I left. The LUAS obviously involved a lot of public meetings and consultations and at all kinds of levels. Because it was a very different kind of project and people were quite scared of it. Sure many people could see the benefits of having a tram reinstated, that the general benefit of it, but of course, not if it is affecting me negatively. And obviously putting a tram through a city is going to affect certain people, for instance I
had to...I had a long standing relationship with people whose homes we were going to be demolish. So that's really, really trying to just explain what was happening, it was a very painful process for them. Then, also as architects, we did everything in our power to design an alternative home, homes for them on the site and ultimately gain their trust. So, it was a very difficult project, but also there was negotiation with senior council, because we were basically writing law. And then, Ballymun Regeneration again, one of the best, most important experiences I had in Ballymun Regeneration wasn't actually to do with designing buildings, it was em, meeting and talking to and going house to house all along the boundary between the housing in Glasnevin and the Ballymun estate and talking to people. We did that as a team. You would say is that the job of an architect. It just completely informed how I thought of the people on the outside of the site who were objecting to developments. You understood why, how it affected their lives and what you needed to do or say to convince people that what was going to happen was an improvement for them to. And that was the most important bit and I have to admit from the outset I was, my attitude was why do I have to go door to door, is this not a job for somebody else? We are architects. I was wrong. I suppose I was going to Ballymun Regeneration because I wanted a job back in mainstream architecture, ha, ha, ha and I found architecture is going door to door. So, Designing Dublin it was wonderful and I suppose Designing Dublin 2, Love the City, was a really great project again. It's about where does policy meet practice and I think that there is a yawning gap in our own way of working and our own development plan, between policy and practice. Our own development plan is so aspirational, what is actually happening to deliver on this development plan? For instance, the Parnell Cultural Quarter, it's been city council policy in the development plan to have a cultural quarter on Parnell Square since 1999 and its only now happening and yet there were so many decisions that were taken that would make you think, why would you do that if you really wanted to do a cultural quarter on Parnell Square, like relocating the Arts Office, which was on Parnell Square, to Foley Street. And that was within an objective to have a cultural quarter on Parnell Square and you kind of think....you can't have a development plan that says something, and yet all the actions and decisions are take which seem to fly in the face of that development plan. Now, there may have been very good reason for moving the arts office to Foley Street and the lab is the most fantastic place and it's great for Foley Street. I just wondered about the decision. So then, Designing Dublin and Love the City was actually about trying to put flesh on the bones on this idea that we have about creating a liveable city. What exactly is meant by that? And how do you do it in practice. Do you just say it and then it be so? No, that's not how it works. You have to do stuff. It was great that the Designing Dublin project actually identified things. And it's great because when it's is an external team, you can say things that are listened to, that might be said internally and it's not listened to. For instance I remember, it was a bit of an eye opener, when Love the City team said 'we can't do a project around Marlborough Street, because it's too difficult, it's almost a policing project.' No we cannot do it, we got to, Vannesa's description, 'we've got to push the slightly open door. We've only got six months here, we are not going to do a project on Marlborough Street, we'd have no impact.' And the rational, there was a very clear rational behind what sites were chosen, which was the Markets Area, which was about what about identifying what is possible in six months.
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Instead of going Marlborough Street, which is a definite challenge, around Abbey Street is a huge challenge, so instead of going ‘hey let’s go there because it is the hugest challenge,’ and end up not being able to achieve anything, instead pick one where there is a good community, a pretty strong community, which is a responsive community. We know that in six months we can probably do something. And that is good because then you can progress. So, I just thought it was a great idea, I though John Tierney was wonderful for supporting it. It was certainly one of the more...it was a very enlightened thing to do and both projects were very well run and Designing Dublin 1 and 2. The people certainly from the city side have benefitted hugely and they have some out of it better.

Me: Have they?
Ali Grehan: Yea, they have, they are just so capable.
Me: Really?
Ali Grehan: They are they are much more capable. It was a capacity building exercise for the people who were involved. And I can only guess, going by my interaction with the volunteers, I think it was an amazing capacity building exercise for those people as well. It was great that those people got access to the city council that was almost unheard of, access at the highest level. That was really great and I just think that in terms of the reputation of the city it has been hugely positive. The reputation being what you do, rather than what you say and just communicating a more open, accessible Dublin City Council. Whether, we are all jumping around now to Designing Dublin principles, we are not, because the City Council is a big organisation, there are 6000 people, we move slowly. I don’t apologise for that. I used to apologise for that, saying oh, we need to be quicker. Hang on a second, we’ve got real, all sorts of constraints to operate in. We have a whole range of approvals that they don’t have the private sector, whether it’s reporting to the department, the government, obviously to our own councillors. We have systems that we have to apply and that means that things move slowly. But cities move slowly, cities don’t change in six months. Cities are long term things and the city council has to keep pace with the city and also has to lead the pace for the city. And also, it cannot be expected to kind of turn things inside out over night. Things take time, just as the Parnell Square Cultural Quarter has taken 15 years and we are not there yet and in fact it will be 20 years before we have actually done it.

Me: Yea, I worked for a couple of years on the Rotunda proposal with Séan Harrington, so there are a couple of years of my life in that plan too.
Ali Grehan: Yea, that’s what happens.
Me: On the whole idea of prototyping and prototyping in the public realm, you had been doing that I think before Designing Dublin, with the installation on Citric Street. It seems that Designing Dublin gave this kind of practice more momentum, or maybe added to the practice of prototyping or added to that culture of trying things out. How do you see it, prototyping as a strategy, fitting in with this system (Dublin City Council)? For instance do you see it as a way of negotiating the red tape of Dublin City Council? So, as a strategy for negotiating the red tape, just try it out?
Ali Grehan: Yea, and we are doing that with Dublin House. We are saying we need to prototype or pilot, but not in a let’s do it design and see if people like that. We’ve already done that. We’ve done that,
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we’ve already done the initial design proposal in 2009 for Dominic Street. Now, that was a design workshop. Then I commissioned the winners of that little one day competition to do a brochure which communicated the Dublin House idea on Dominic Street, because that was the competition site. That gained a certain amount of traction and where do we go from here? Well, we are going to have to do one, not twenty and cast it in the realm of the possible, the probable possible and don’t so overburden this experimental project that it has to fail. Don’t design it to fail, which can so often happen. And if you set the bar to high, you are designing to fail. On the other hand, all of the questions about Dublin House is who’s eligible to apply, what would be the final output, how does the city council dispose of a site to small scale developers...all of these kind of questions. About is this right? Why is the city council spending time promoting private development? I thought you guys were about social housing, all that kind of stuff, all those kind of questions. You only find the answers to those kind of questions by working through on a particular site. And then you gain credibility, because if you finish one, and if it is at a small enough scale, the problems that you are going to meet are manageable, they are not multiplied by 100. So that is one thing, it makes it easier to confront the issues and to deal with the issues and to find answers to questions, if the question can be kept as simple as possible. So the hope is, we will call it a pilot on Fishamble Street, it will be a development, but it’s a development on a scale that makes it possible to implement. And then, we learn from that and if we go to something bigger and expanding the scale of Dublin House, then we will have a system in place. So that’s what piloting is....but, piloting in terms of years, a few years of a pilot, rather than a few months. So, it is an important thing to do. And we are also taking that approach with the public realm strategy and I think that was informed by Designing Dublin. In that we said, we can talk about developing a public realm strategy forever, because ultimately the public realm is where, that is where all the departments of Dublin City Council meet. And that is where all the people in Dublin meet, in public space. And it’s back to that thing the guy sitting on Wolftone Square, wondering why isn’t as successful as it should have been, doesn’t care whose department is responsible for this. They just want to know how can it work better. So, we eventually decided, we still have lots of questions about how this public realm group is supposed to work, let’s just identify projects that identify particular public realm issues, like anti-social behaviour, dumping, whatever and identify a pilot site and we will improve the public realm experience in these particular areas and in doing that we will figure out how to work together and where the give and take is. So, that is also piloting. So it is about accepting that there is, it’s ok to maybe not succeed completely and not have 100% success. And actually that is fine, because what you are doing with the 50% success is learning and the 50% failure is also learning. So, its 100% learning. So yes, the piloting is a good idea and it’s such a good idea that we are doing it.

Me: I guess I am trying to establish is this emerging culture of prototyping and piloting created by Designing Dublin alone or was it a thing that was creeping in anyway?
Ali Grehan: Of course it was creeping in anyway. But again, it’s back to that thing of talking and doing and the fact that resources had to be supplied to Designing Dublin, people had to be asked to do things, that the city had to sign up to some kind of investment, because there was some level of investment. Now, it
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was amazing that there were volunteers, but it was through the generosity of a lot of people that it happened. But there was an investment from the city council, I had to let, or sign off, three of the architectural team were assigned.

Me: Out of how many overall?

Ali Grehan: Well we are now down to sixty overall. Now, that is not all architects, that is admin, engineers, technicians, inspectors, architects. So, three people out of a team of thirty is a lot. So, Jeremy went into the first Designing Dublin, and Shane and Ciarán, Shane Warring and Ciarán Stanley, went into Designing Dublin 2. So that was a huge investment for us. And so it has affected what we can do. And on the other hand, it is a worthwhile investment, just for capacity building. So, Jeremy is now working with 'The Studio' and he works one day a week in city architect’s. And Shane Warring is working on Dublin House. So, because the experience he got working on Designing Dublin is the right kind of experience to work on Dublin House.

Me: So, let me just check my list of items here. Now, specifically, in the Markets Area, did you think that any of those prototypes that were tried out could be implemented permanently, or what did you think of them. I know it is a while ago now, but if you could take you mind back a bit.

Ali Grehan: The value of focusing on the Markets is that it is such a potentially positive development area. I mean we don’t, there is now a focus on trying to establish the Market as a markets, real markets area, again that has been there for a while, but it seems to have galvanised the local businesses to look at some kind of a...at what need to happen to turn the markets building into something more retail focused, rather than something that is more wholesale and closed down for most of the day. Also, Dublin City Council are spending money on refurbishing the building and...but particular projects there were more just interesting in terms of communication pieces, in that they showed that there is such a strong community there. And I think that is often overlooked so often. People often have this...such a prejudicial view of Dublin City Centre, I think people outside and beyond don’t think that anybody lives here, or owns it or loves it. That whenever people talk about it, or get nostalgic about Dublin City Centre, it’s always ‘the rare auld times’ stuff. Ah, my grandmother was from the liberties, ah remember going to visit somebody around Stoneybatter or wherever. And that may be nostalgia for lots of people, but its reality for many other people. And the city centre is actually a living, breathing place, full of people who are champions, and could be champions, they just need to be given permission to be champions and be told, yea we believe in you, you are not actually railing against the system, you are not, kind of believing in something that nobody else believes in. You know, we believe in it too. And, I know that sounds kind of blindingly obvious, I’m not sure it is necessarily born out in what we do; the city centre isn’t a nine to five place, as in a place where people work, and a place where you know nine to five Dublin City Council are working, the city centre is 24 hours, there are lots of people, you guys discovered lots of people who are Dublin City Council who are 24 hours championing the place. Those people need to be celebrated. And that’s what you did with your project. You celebrated city champions. I thought that was really lovely, because you know, those people need affirmation, they need to be recognised, and then if they
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are recognised it gives them confidence and it encourages them to work harder and to do more, because they know that they are being acknowledged.

Me: So it sounds like what you saw the role of Designing Dublin was that that is was this potential link between policy and implementation on one hand. The prototypes were more like propositions....

Ali Grehan: They were relationship building exercises

Me: Yes

Ali Grehan: That’s what they were and that’s what their value is, that’s what they should have been. That’s what they were meant to be. And in that sense they are successful. Just as you mention Lilliput, the Lilliput project was a huge confidence building exercise for the joinery workshop in Cherry Orchard. Because nobody has...they hadn’t really been asked to make things in a creative way before. Yet, that’s what they do. So if you are going to get people to think harder about what they are doing, you are only going to do that if you let people know that their time and investment isn’t being wasted. That it is worth doing. And after that project they were so chuffed with what they had done, that they asked me to do a poster for them for their workshop, so that they could remember. And, when we were doing something for the intercultural conference, which involved Ray Yeats and Tara Wheelan, Tara who is alumni of Designing Dublin, the Civic Works, we needed to get something built, just a screen for the particular design challenge that was being held over a dinner, over the intercultural cities conference, and the Civic Works had won that opportunity to run that little challenge, the Cherry Orchard Joinery Workshop were like that! (clicks fingers) ‘Yes we want to do it, will do it, we will make that for you, because we love doing that kind of thing, working with nutters.’ Ha, ha, ha

Me: Ha, ha, ha

Ali Grehan: Because it is inspirational for them, I spend, actually with Lilliput, it was em, during Innovation Dublin 2009 and I remember it was the same day, we set up the Lilliput installation the same day as the Dublin House design workshop was happening. And I thought all I was going to have to do was go to the design workshop and brief everybody, let them get on with it, then I was going to go up to Lilliput or Stoneybatter and make sure everything was fine, and then go back and watch the design challenge. But the first thing is I go up to Stoneybatter and the first thing I see is a load of cars parked on the street, where we are supposed to be doing the installation. So I say, hang on a second, so how do we get...I had to go door to door and ask who owns these cars and can you move them and we are doing something here, we are erecting something for the weekend, we told everybody we are doing it, but still there are cars parked. Then the guys arrived from the depot with all the material, and the artists arrived and we said ok we are going to have to work together to make this. So, we worked all day putting it together. And it was wonderful and local people stopped to help and they got commandeered, so by the end of it we had a little construction team putting it together, but it was working with the guys, they said things like ‘the wife will not believe what I am doing today’. And they were so pleased with what they had done. There was this job satisfaction and that is how people are encouraged to try harder because they are, because they do something. They give a little bit extra and it is recognised and therefore, they
are more likely to give a bit extra again and that’s how you get the best out of people and it’s not easy because there are, you know, it’s not like it’s all motherhood and apple-pie, it is not easy, you know.

Me: But part of that is the whole idea of making something together and everybody plugging into something that you can kind of get your head around as well, because it is happening right in front of you.

Ali Grehan: It is a very democratic space.

Me: Yea, it is I think definitely. You could imagine a city that had all of this, make and do and prototyping happening all the time, that people actually got to have input into it. Do you see that as a possibility or as a good thing, like that kind of city where the public realm is constantly being made and remade and that is somehow accessible to people? Maybe like in Beta Projects and the overall vision for that, that there are all these little things that are happening all over the place and people get to feed into that all the time. What do think about that, or how do you think that could work as an idea?

Ali Grehan: Well there is a, I know that in London, there is talk of having an area where there are no rules. I’m not sure how far that is gone. It is interesting. There could be a prototyping corridor. We talked about this when we were doing the World Design Capital bid and with the seed projects. I had this idea that we would have developed seed projects that would develop into more permanent outcomes that could inform, obviously it would be beneficially locally, but it would have national and international significance or relevance. And we had a workshop in the Science Gallery where people just to see what people thought of this seed project idea. And it was so clear that there was such consensus about what people wanted to do that is just seemed like, well instead of you just doing your seed project and me doing me seed project and they are only connected because they are part of this world design capital bid, there should be this physical connector. So, if you pick a part of the city, any part Thomas Street, Abbey Street, whatever, maybe it should go north/south, doesn’t really matter, it should just be a spine, we focus on allowing collaborative projects along that route so that people can know that they are not part of a general strategy, but that they are part of a geographically specific strategy. And that is what Designing Dublin is about. So, I agree we should do that, we should do that. Interestingly, when you go back to the Parnell Square Cultural Quarter, we’re saying that this is strategically the right place because of its geographical location in the city, not because it’s an area that needs investment, not just that it’s more strategically important because. It’s at the northern tip of the civic spine, which connects the key historic places in the city and that’s en-route to what’s going to be the DIT at Grangegorman. And so, if you get people thinking, realising that you’ve got different city projects that are really significant, not just that they are historically significant places, but that there are projects under way now, that are actually all along the civic spine and Parnell Square Cultural Quarter is just part of it. It gives it a physical context that makes is more compelling for people. They can get their head around that. Rather than saying ‘hey this is great and it is going to be generally brilliant and its going to have this intangible kind of impetus for regeneration generally. Now I know that does work. That is what happens. It’s not just direct lines on a map.’ But if you are going to try and communicate what something you can achieve, it is much easier to just draw a line on a map.
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Me: Yea
Ali Greehan: That is where we are focusing. Sorry, it's almost one and I have a meeting.
Me: Well, thank you so much for those thoughts and for your time. I will send you on the transcription for your approval.
Recorder switched off.
Interview John Tierney

Date: 11th February
Time: 12.00 noon
Location: Dr. John Tierney's Office, 4th Floor, Dublin City Council Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8
Attendees: John Tierney (JT) and Nuala Flood (NF)
Transcription: Nuala Flood

Introduction:
The interview took place in an office which overlooks the river Liffey. We, Dr. John Tierney and I, sit at two low black leather armchairs on either side of a wooden coffee table. I take out the consent form for him to sign and explain the purpose of the interview. I tell him that I am conducting it as part of my PhD research, in Trinity College Dublin, which is about understanding Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn as a model for the collaborative development of the city. I remind him that I had worked on the second DD:LL project, Love the City, as a design researcher on the design team and as a participant observer for my PhD research. I inform him that I am now following up what are, in his opinion, the legacies of the project, both for DCC and for the city itself. I also inform him that through this interview I am hoping to clarify some issues associated with the project also. I discuss that the fact that this is not an anonymous interview and that I wanted to interview him, in his official role, as Dublin City Manager, because he could offer a good overview of the project and how being involved in it has affected both DCC and the city itself. I tell him that the interview will be recorded using a digital recording device, that he will given the opportunity to amend the transcript, if necessary. I also inform him that the sound files will be destroyed once the PhD project has been completed.

At this point the recording device is turned on.

Interview Transcription:

NF: To start with could explain to me how you came to be involved with the DD:LL.
JT: Well, I met with Jim and Jean, gosh I can't remember how far back it is now, but anyway they came in with this idea and introduced me to Vanessa Ahuactzin and talked to me about the Massive Change project in the States and they thought that this whole design thinking concept had great potential and I have to say it struck a chord with me. One of the things I would have been trying to...find a way through I suppose is...how you create different mindsets in the organisation. I sometimes describe that, you know, some staff in big, institutional organisation, such as this, can become victims of structure and tradition. And there were many other things, I suppose that, that helped with our challenges, whether its forms of public consultation with the community and how you get the community more involved in the decision making and so on, so it appealed to me in many of those fronts.

NF: And so trying to get the community involved was a....
JT: That was part of it, but also getting the staff to think differently, about both service and community would have been a very valuable piece of what was being described to me.

NF: And how did you see the difference....

JT: I suppose the big difference was the approach to design itself and that could be the design itself, and that could be the design of service, that could be the design of consultation. It was that somewhat different approach where ideation and prototyping and all of that was much more fundamental part of how you went about your business.

NF: So it was about the novel....

JT: So yes, it was about the novel, but also about the practical part of it as well. It was going to challenge people in a way that they had never been challenged before.

NF: The staff from DCC?

JT: Yes.

NF: And getting the community more involved in the design as well, could you say a little more about that.

JT: Well I mean that was very important, I mean the very first project we picked was an example of a new community. So how does a new community bond, especially in a more dense, urban situation, as opposed to the natural creation of communities in smaller villages, whether it was in the city or in the country previously and you know even where you had burgeoning populations in outer villages, you still had the core of what was a community. So, how could you analyse, what would make a community come together and prioritise things for themselves and create community leaders which, again is something which is a bit more difficult, where you bring a lot of people together in just one moment in time, to a new dense housing development,

NF: So, how do you feel it all went then...

JT: Well, I suppose we learnt a lot about the community piece, the great difficulty was that it coincided with the downturn in the economy and what you could or couldn’t do in the area, but the nucleus of that community is still there in my view. And its interaction with the city council, I think is, much more positive. Plus, you had some building blocks up there, which were helpful like Fr. Collins Park or the work that was done around the community unit where people could come together....I suppose it was a bit different than the project that was done in the city centre, in terms of where that went from and how you involved the city centre community in that particular project was probably a much greater challenge. But for me, and I suppose this is a selfish aspect to it, we now have the studio set up, which grew organically out of the project, well the two projects. And that for me was always my aim to try and embed it within the organisation on a gradual basis. That has probably had its own challenges in that we have a staff moratorium now, so it is not as easy to assign staff to something like that. But we have a good core group of staff there, they are now concentrating on four different areas, whether it is new forms of public consultation and how we do our statutory consultation, but maybe in a slightly different way, the ideas competition which is I think has been successful for us to date, again getting people involved in how services or projects might be run differently by the city council, thirdly, the whole service
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redesign, which is a piece that I'd be very interested in and is now beginning to take hold and they are doing a couple of pilot projects in that. And fourthly, Dublinked, which has been a revelation in the management of that, and creating that data portal in which we now have interaction with multinationals, small and medium enterprises, and other organisations and was one of the fundamental reasons why IBM set up their first smart cities technology centre in Dublin. So you know, from small acorns...things can blossom.

NF: So this is all as a result of DD:LL?
JT: Absolutely and it gave a structure and a framework for wanting to do things, that I thought fundamentally needed to be done in the organisation anyway.

NF: Like what?
JT: Like that whole thing of how you approach the services we do and not just assuming that, you know say you are a new staff member that comes in or you're a staff member transferred from another area, not assuming that the way the thing was always done is the right way of doing it.

NF: Yea
JT: So how you do try and get a mechanism where people are more and more questioning. So, this can be a building block for that.

NF: So do you feel like there has been a cultural change within the organisation?
JT: That I suppose is too big a claim, at this stage. Certainly it has made a difference, but we have a long way to go before you could say we have had a cultural change. And that's not unexpected in an organisation of this size, with its history and traditions and the manner in which services are delivered. But gradually over time that will change and this will be a fundamental part of that change.

NF: So you feel like there is a kind of, eh a looser, eh more creative way of....
JT: Taking hold in the organisation?
NF: Yea.
JT: And it has manifested itself in other ways, whether it's a direct correlation or not is hard to define, but for example the work that was done on the World Design Capital, I suppose having the courage to go and do something like that. The projects that we would have done in Designing Dublin would have been helpful in creating that courage, so to speak.

NF: This is slightly off topic, but do you feel like there was a particular kind of North American, can do, influence that....
JT: Well certainly, Vanessa was very important. By God, she could drive people to lengths they didn't realise they could go to. And that was all part of the developmental piece of the...you see I would have thought that for anyone who was on it, it was a slightly a... no not slightly, a life changing experience and for the vast majority a very positive experience. And maybe change mindsets about what they may want to do with the rest of their lives. Certainly for some people anyway.

NF: And how do you feel the city is different or do you feel that there is now a different way of approaching development?
JT: I don’t think you can make that claim either. I mean that will happen over time, I mean, we used, for example, the consultation methods, as part of the Fade Street project, the Grafton Street project, the strategic development zone within the docklands, so the tools that were learned are being used. I suppose there are other things that are happening at a city wide level, but it depends on what you describe as city wide. You know the Dublin Project with the IwB [Institute without Boundaries] has also grown out of this, em, that has led to the creation of a Masters in Design Practice in DIT, which was one of the fundamental aims of Jean and Jim when they set out on this themselves. And also I am delighted with that because it gives an opportunity for people to get formal training and get formal accreditation for what they do. And we think that there is the potential for an IwB [Institute without Boundaries] outreach to be created in Dublin and one of the things we are looking at is that there will be a summer school on this kind of innovative thinking. Rather than having a summer school on literature or politics, we might end up with a summer school on innovation here in Dublin, which would be quite, innovative.


JT: And from that might grow this outreach with the IwB [Institute without Boundaries], which could become a European outreach.

NF: So, using the city as a testbed for innovation?

JT: Yea, and also creating a network of innovators who can learn from each other, not necessarily just within the city council, but within other organisations, state organisations operating within the city.

NF: Do you feel that there are legacies of the project can in the Markets Area? Has there been any kind of....

JT: I don’t think there has been a legacy in the Markets Area. There is still an awful lot of work to be done there. I’d say relationships have been improved with some of the organisations in the area, but there is still a lot of work to be done to drive forward the development of that area to its full potential, a lot of work to be done. We are doing some work, but I suppose again the whole availability of funding, that shouldn’t be the only catalyst, but it’s an important catalyst and that has been a bit of a struggle.

NF: So, do you feel like it is a more promising way to develop that area as opposed to the master plan that was proposed for it?

JT: Well, it was certainly a more interactive way to do it. And a much better way to create awareness of the strengths of the area, the people who are making the area what it is and that was very important. But the trouble is if you don’t have continuous follow up to that, it can lose its dynamic.

NF: And the continuous follow up would have possibly been a Designing Dublin 3.0 there or?

JT: Well, I think it would have actually have been actions implemented on the ground, which would have been a follow up from that. Not necessarily a....certainly a Designing Dublin 3 would have been helpful...but I think that physical actions on the ground would have been a good way to manifest that.

NF: And this prototyping in the public space, what do you think about that?

JT: I think this is a very good idea and I think that this is one of the things that is now happening as a follow up and as part of the Dublin Project with the IwB [Institute without Boundaries] where we are looking at different things to do with....whether its interaction with the public on the street, through
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street furniture, or street conversations or whatever. There is a good bit of prototyping going into the work that is being done on that. Rather than assuming that there is one design, certainly the prototyping really helps with that.

NF: So there is a kind of a space to be critical with prototyping?
JT: And you can put something up and see what peoples reaction is to it.
NF: So it (prototyping) could be a, eh, tool for deepening democracy?
JT: Absolutely. And of course if people see examples of what you are talking about, because plans don't do it for people a lot of the time. You can get a very quick response. Even you know I suppose....its not tied in directly but...we've done some quirky designs to the wifi locations, I don't know whether you've seen them or not?
NF: No, I haven't.
JT: With the little mosaics, which depict locations of the wifi, we have everything from the Dub going to the match in the mosaic, to the pyjama girl...
NF: Ha, ha...
JT: Its quirky alright...
NF: Ha, ha, where is that now...
JT: How many locations is it that we have now in total, is it ten locations...you'll see one of them below at Bernardo's Square, just down here, I forget now which is on the mosaic, but you'll see the mosaic on the side of the little civic building down from the city hall..
NF: Cool, I'll definitely check that out. I mean I think that for me is one of the most promising things to come out of it (DD:LL) is the idea of prototyping on an urban scale and I want to follow up on that with figuring out what is the regulatory framework around it, you know, is it always done as a kind of an exempted development as a temporary art piece, or ....
JT: It probably depends on the scale of what you are going to do. But you could talk to, I am sure you are talking to Deirdre as part of this?
NF: Yes, yes, I will be....
JT: She might be able to talk to you, I don't know myself how much prototyping they did as part of the bit of work they are doing with the coroner's office on service redesign for example. But they have been starting with a couple of small examples in relation to the service redesign before they start to pick on slightly bigger service areas.
NF: So now....if there was going to be a third iteration of Designing Dublin, that was not the masters, but maybe was closer to what DD:LL 2.0 was, because my understanding was that a third didn't happen because of budget constraints....or do you just....
JT: Well, I suppose, what we've got into now is the more formal thing with the Dublin Project, with IwB [Institute without Boundaries] and with DIT, it's not quite, obviously, what ye went through, but I suppose it is coming closer to where when Jean and Jim set out, that you would formalise this within the academic institutions, that you would create the potential for the projects to be done with the city as part of that cooperation and collaboration, which is, you know what's been done in the Dublin Project at
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the moment. So, Jeremy and Deirdre are on their way off to a charrette in Toronto, they are not gone, but they must be close to being gone at this stage. And they had a charrette here which was very interesting, where they presented their ideas on what you could do, with design on the street, with the consultation piece and all of that. It was very interesting. And I’m sure Deirdre will give you all the detail of that. So we didn’t do a Designing Dublin 3.0, but we are into another phase of trying to use the principles of that now within a framework developed between the city council, the IwB [Institute without Boundaries] and DIT. And I think IADT may become involved. They are sending 20 over to the charrette in Toronto.

NF: Wow, ok.

JT: So they are very interested. And I think it’s a better way to have it that way, because now, almost by getting into the yearly cycle with the third level institution, there’s that ongoing framework they have for projects.

NF: Hmmm, so there’s consistent follow up.

JT: Yea, and there’s accreditation for what you do, which is very important.

NF: If you were to take the this method of city development to the extreme and say if there was prototyping happening all the time out on the street, and everyday there is something new happening and you can comment on it, as a pedestrian using QR codes or something like that, maybe more like the idea of BETA projects, how do you think that would be for Dublin? Or do you have any thoughts on that?

JT: Well I think if we could become a first, or maybe we wouldn’t be the first in doing that, then I think it would add to this I suppose this idea that we are trying to promote, of the city as a testbed, because a Dubliner will give their comment very quickly, about what you’ll produce on the street. But we are already getting a reputation, which is what we want, with the larger companies, with the willingness to allow for the testbedding. There is a fantastic project at the moment with Glendimplex, called the Quantum Project. I don’t know whether you’ve read about that.

NF: Yea, yes I have.

JT: Where they are using properties belonging to the city and Fingal, and DCU to test their product. That’s exactly what we want. IBM are testing on the water system. They are testing their pressure management system. Intel are testing their city watch system. So, the public are probably are probably going to become engaged with some of those, because with city watch for instance, that’s the whole premise, that the public becomes involved. So, if we can broaden that out to eh, I suppose, prototyping possible solutions to traffic problems, or whatever it is. Now how you do that, I suppose, and keep the city functioning, is something that we would have to crack. But there is nothing to say that we couldn’t move to that over time. And I think as the studio start to widen their horizons in term of the services they look at, that could be one of the things that comes out of that. That willingness to prototype more.

NF: So in a way...

JT: But you need ideas first.

NF: Yea...
JT: And it’s to get the idea generation will actually encourage the prototyping. So when you can get three of four valid ideas, rather than having one only, produced by a consultant.

NF: Well I guess that through the prototypes, you will get more ideas about possible future prototypes also.

JT: Well, as we know it is an iterative process after that, and you’ll learn from each stage of the prototyping.

NF: So, it sounds like you trying to work towards a more collaborative model of city development. So you have big business trying out things, people feeding into big business and what they are thinking about. And in that way everyone is working together toward the betterment of the city?

JT: Yea, but even at other levels there are other things happening. We have a thing called activating Dublin that is happening through the Creative Dublin Alliance, which is all about getting business more involved in projects, and actually maybe contributing pro bono to projects. In other words, say at the moment we have, Dublin on-line, which is being lead by Google, Facebook and Paypal. And with the potential for UPC and Vodafone, I think, to become involved as well. They are looking at doing a pilot with 20 businesses and getting them on line with the hope to maybe grow that to maybe 1000 businesses. So, that’s a new form of interaction with the city, business and which again is falling out of the Creative Alliance. Where a lot of the work we have done, there is Designing Dublin, has been given that wider exposure so to speak. And you know Jean has been on the Creative Alliance, almost since the beginning and now she is being replaced by Jim Dunne. You know there is continuity from the Designing Dublin perspective, feeding into those wider issues for the city....which shouldn’t be forgotten about either.

NF: Any other thoughts you would like to add....

JT: I suppose this was a very different journey to embark upon for a public sector organisation, but one which has been very worthwhile. And we do have a basis for this to become a very strong part of the organisation, through the work of The Studio in particular, within the city council. And I think, for me, the learning that the people got, the potential to make use of that learning, now through The studio and it’s potential to have an influence on the city council and therefore the city, offers a path forward.

NF: Well thank you for all that information.

JT: You are very welcome.

NF: I don’t think there is anything else I wanted to cover.

JT: Well, when you send me the stuff, I might slightly reshape answers when I look at it and when I think about it. And I might add other things and I’m sure you’ll have no problem with that.

NF: No not at all.

NF: Oh and Beta projects what do you think of that? As a more, it’s quite direct, isn’t it?

JT: When you say Beta Projects, describe it a little bit for me?

NF: As of yet what I understand it as, is that there is a facebook page and you can put up an idea of what you want to do with something in the public realm, for people to comment on. Say the first project was the about painting the traffic boxes and a person can say I want to paint something on that, for that
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amount of time and then ask the Beta followers what do you think of that. Then if nobody else says that they want to do it, then you can get to do it for that that amount of time. So it’s more direct influence I guess on the physical fabric.

JT: I’m sure we are probably doing some of that already. It’s a bit like using social media to your benefit. It’s all part of, I suppose, communicating in a slightly different way because we have a slightly different world. Didn’t we do that with the Templebar piece in terms of the traffic box.

NF: I don’t know, but you did it in the Markets Area anyway. So you might have done it in Templebar too.

JT: With the Dublin Project, they could have got up to several things and I might not be up to speed on it.

NF: And I guess, somebody at some stage is going to ask how do you not take advantage of people doing work for the city. Say for instance, some of the well know criticisms of Big Society, could be also be applied to this kind of way of developing a city. How do you find the right balance between people having an influence on their public realm, but also not allowing them to be taken advantage of, in terms of being used, to provide public services that should be provided by the government?

JT: Well you see ultimately there is only so much consultation you can do, or so much agreement you can get. We had a very successful piece above on Fade Street where the businesses really came on board. But there will be times when you have to stand back and make a decision, despite all the consultation you do. But I think if you can base it upon how you dealt with the feedback, that’s fair enough. Everybody is not going to get everything they want. Because part of our job is to manage influence and to manage protest. And you’ll never get 100% agreement on anything usually. You’d be surprised if you do. So, there comes a point in time where you are the local government, but I think if you can show a audited trail of what you did, and how you dealt with it, then I think you know, it’s easier to stack it up.

NF: So transparency?

JT: Yes.

NF: And prototyping is great for that I guess.

JT: Exactly.

NF: There it is (she makes an outstretched hand gesture), have you thoughts heard. Ok well, thank you very much. That is great.
Appendix 6

Email from John Tierney, the City Manager, acknowledging the contributions of DD:LL
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The following correspondence was sent from John Tierney, the City Manager, to Jean Byrne, the founder of D21C, after the completion of Love the City. Subsequently, Jean Byrne forwarded this email to all members of the DD:LL design team.

From: John Tierney <John.Tierney@dublincity.ie>
Date: 29 August 2011 15:27:08 IST
To: 'jean byrne' <jean4b@eircom.net>
Cc: 'Vannesa Ahuactzin' <vannesa@design21c.com>, Deirdre Ni Raghallaigh <Deirdre.NiRaghallaigh@dublincity.ie>, Michael Stubbs <michael.stubbs@dublincity.ie>, Catherine Darmody <catherine.darmody@dublincity.ie>
Subject: Designing Dublin

26th August 2011

Jean Byrne
Design 21C

Dear Jean

I hope yourself; Jim, Barry and Vannesa have enjoyed your respective and well deserved breaks during the summer particularly after the challenge of and your huge input into Designing Dublin: Love the City.

We in the City Council have now had the opportunity to read (and reread) and digest the Compendium: *Designing Dublin: Learning to Learn*. Firstly I want to congratulate all concerned on the comprehensive nature of that work. The volume even exceeds the high standard of documentation previously displayed throughout the iterations of this project. It is very valuable for the City Council to have this work as a record of what happened over the last two years of Designing Dublin. The breadth of activities, energy and creativity is hugely impressive. The volume provides us with new possibilities and will no doubt be a very useful toolkit for people undertaking new projects in Dublin and indeed any other City.

I would like to update you on some of the issues that were raised in the Compendium and during the projects. The Fruit and Vegetable Markets will be prototyping new retail elements during innovation month. Dublin City Council Development Department are investigating possibilities of developing this market and are learning from successful markets elsewhere. In true Designing Dublin style the proposal will be prototyped at an early stage to test the concept.
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The difficulty of wayfinding to and through the Markets is rightly mentioned throughout the Compendium. Our City Architect’s Department is currently looking at possibilities of identifying and marking routes particularly from Mary Street and Capel Street.

The City Council has learned a lot from how you worked with others and how you prototyped street furniture, posters and other installations on the street. These are aspects we wish to include both in the Grafton Street Area Enhancement Plan and in forthcoming Public Realm initiatives. I was very glad to see that many of the Designing Dublin alumni worked with the Grafton Street Team to actively engage people on street for their views on the area. These people found it difficult to believe that the City Council were engaging in this “new” way.

John Conroy and Mary Mooney in the Studio have used their skills to design up a very engaging way for people to discuss the issues around the integration of new communities, recycling some of the Designing Dublin pallet furniture in the process.

The community, in Clongriffin, continues to use Suite 60 as a community space with the support of the local area office. The Path to the Coast and the Clongriffin Business hub communities are still moving these projects on but in their own ways.

The Studio team is still a prototype on how your methods can work in an organisational setting. There have been very positive outcomes in the Staff Ideas Scheme and on Grafton Street and on our Open Data project Dublinked which is to be launched soon. The team is now addressing how we can change the way we deliver some of our services. This work continues to be challenging.

I am delighted that you and so many of the alumni are still working closely with us on Pivot Dublin, public engagement, open data, potential EU projects and the potential collaboration with the Institute Without Boundaries. The prospect of further partnership during the proposed Masters Programme delivered through NUIM will be beneficial to the participants and to Dublin City Council staff. I am also aware that Deirdre has contacted Vannesa about doing some work with the studio later this year.

Thank you for your commitment and vision in pursuing this project. Please extend my deep appreciation on behalf of Dublin City Council management and staff to all the participants for their creative input and hard work over the last two years. I want to particularly thank the volunteers on both projects who gave so generously of their time and talents to work for our City.

There are a number of issues we need to follow up on so I will ask Catherine to make contact to arrange a meeting a mutually convenient date and time.
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Regards,
John
Appendix 7

Samples of earlier iterations of the *Finding the Hidden Potential of Place* diagram
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The primary approach to collaborative city development - diagram based on DfI:ED 1.0.

The process:

Design as a good way to synthesise ideas.

Outcome:

5 prototypes designed to revitalise the area.

Using a design process to address the need that is currently not met.

Focus on an overall prototype.

Prototype 5.

Example project.

Prototype 4.

Example project.

Prototype 3.

Still lives.

Prototype 2.

Still lives.

Prototype 1.

Still lives.

Valuing their creative input.

Do not create consideration.

Get their specific knowledge relevant.

Ensure result.

Targeted groups of city users.

The teams leaders.

The creative director.

The volunteers.

The Dublin staff.

The multidisciplinary design team.

THREE GROUPS

GET THEIR KNOWLEDGE

SELECT DAI OR DIT TEAM

WILLING THEIR CREATIVE INPUT

DELIC FOUNDERS

THE RESEARCH GROUP

HIGH LEVEL DEL STAFF

THE AUTHOR.

THE GROUPS.

Take their needs into account when creating project to revitalise the city.

The public money.

Pay for public money.

Design.

THE DESIGN PROCESS.

SD-DESIGN.

Seeds.

Seeds.

Seeds.

Seeds.

Seeds.

Seeds.
Appendix 8

Samples of earlier iterations of the *Love the City* visualisation
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