New Normals and Narratives of Nothing: Affect and Planning

Sophie Solomon

Abstract
This project centers around a recognition that cities, fundamentally, are sites of identity. Embedded in place at all times, we are constantly in states of becoming, being formed by our surroundings and interactions and forming others in return. This becoming is one that is situated in affect. When urban planners intervene in space, we are fundamentally intervening in identity, and in processes of affective connection. With this in mind, this project uncovers how affect operates within processes of urban planning, specifically in the context of urban change and displacement. This project asks how this understanding can then be used to better imagine a planning processes founded in the affective dimension. Through an initial engagement with projects responding to processes of urban change, development, and displacement in Seattle, I find a dichotomy between planning practice, and projects from artists, activists, and residents pushing back against displacement. Artist, resident, and activist-led projects seem to be situated in the affective dimension, whereas planning practice is not. This dichotomy is significant, as it creates a climate where people and planners operate in opposition with one another. It creates a gap between the reality of lived experience of place, and decision making processes that, in many ways, govern these spaces. In engaging with narratives within projects pushing back against displacement, and with the urban planning process, I analyze why this gap exists. This project aims to lessen this gap, imagining a planning process that is fundamentally situated within the affective dimension.

Introduction

Cities, fundamentally, are sites of identity. As we are situated in and moving through spaces, we are constantly in states of becoming, being formed by our surroundings and interactions and forming others in return, a becoming that is situated in affect. When urban planners intervene in space, we are fundamentally intervening in identity, and in processes of affective connection.

This project centers around a recognition of this reality, and an examination of whether planning practice can begin to engage with the affective dimension meaningfully. When I mention the affective dimension, I am referring to the realm of affect, to the idea that our relation to and engagement with world is structured through embodied forces, forces that occur at sites of encounter. In this sense, then, when I say that planners intervene in processes of affective connection, I understand planning scholarship and practice as needing to meaningfully engage with the affective dimension in order to effectively base decision making processes that shape the urban environment in order to center planning practice in the nuanced, complicated, and affective lived reality of place.

This recognition is not a simple one. Affect, as a theory, is ephemeral, the sensations that affect theory refers to evade categorization, evade recognition, and evade linear representation. Affective encounter and affective sensation are always with us, and always shaping us, but do so without making

2

much noise, almost subconsciously. Much work has been done to understand affect's role in the everyday, and much work needs to be done to bring this understanding into the realm of planning, and my work represents, in this sense, one step of a multidimensional, continuing process.

With this in mind, I this engagement as "an experiment, not a judgement."[1] I borrow here from affect scholar Kathleen Stewart here, who engages with the nuance of affect in everyday in her work Ordinary Affects. Stewart goes on to say,

> "Committed not to the demystification and uncovered truths that support a well-known picture of the world, but rather to speculation, curiosity, and the concrete, [Ordinary Affects] tries to provoke attention to the forces that come into view as habit or shock, resonance or impact. Something throws itself together in a moment as an event and a sensation; a something both animated and inhabitable."[2]

In this statement, Stewart points to the nuance of engaging with affect, and the difficulty of constructing linear analysis in the face of an ephemeral understanding of the world. I recognize this as a strength of affect as a theoretical model, one that does not shy away from the complicated nature of the everyday we are embedded within. I strive to do this in my work here.

That being said, though, this is an engagement directly with planning practice, and with that in mind, I want to be mindful of how I engage within this. Planning practice is a real, everyday, live phenomena, as I write this it is shaping various everydays. With this in mind, as an attempt to recognize the real world implications of my work, and the real world implications of planning process for individual lives and identity, I situate my work in the context of the Yesler Terrace redevelopment, an affordable housing site and community that is currently being redeveloped in Seattle. Yesler is a place of much memory, and of much personal importance, and I strive throughout my work to be mindful of this.

In this process, I engage directly with projects and narratives within the Yesler Terrace redevelopment. Using the Seattle Housing Authority's (SHA), the authority in charge of Yesler Terrace, process as a model of the planning practice, I begin to explore an observed dichotomy between planning

---

[1] Kathleen Stewart. *Ordinary Affects* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2007), 1.
[2] Ibid. 2.

practice, which seems to be situated in the affective dimension, and projects directly from residents responding to this redevelopment, or documenting their lives at Yesler, which seem to fundamentally be situated in the affective dimension. This dichotomy is significant, it creates a climate in which planners and people operate in opposition of one another, and in which processes that shape the urban environment are disconnected from those for whom they effect. With this in mind, in my work, I argue that affect provides a lens for thinking through how to bridge this gap. I explore the gaps between the nuance that these projects allow for, and their fundamental recognition of urban space as a site of identity and affective encounter, and begin to first steps for deconstructing this gap, beginning to imagine a planning practice that is fundamentally situated in the affective dimension.

In outlining first steps, I recognize a key element of processes of these projects from Yesler Terrace that is helpful in imagining a planning process that engages meaningfully with the nuance that affect allows for — a recognition of the everyday as a site of nuanced and deep meaning — and outline an element of the planning process that I find to be limiting these meaningful engagements — problem-based comprehensive planning. I recognize that outlining a planning practice situated in the affective dimension will take much time and potential structural change, but through this discussion, I begin the first steps of doing this within my work.

I begin here, with a further discussion of this methodology, and then move into an outlining of the foundations of my work, affect theory, Yesler Terrace, and the planning process. From there, I move into a discussion of the narratives and projects I am working with at Yesler Terrace, and use my analysis of the way in which these projects engage with the affective dimension as a foundation for outlining key first steps to beginning to imagine a planning process founded in the affective dimension.

Methods

This project is the second step of a two part process of beginning to read affect theory into the urban planning process. I began, first, with an initial engagement with the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace, an affordable housing community in Seattle that is currently in the process of being redeveloped, to see how affect emerged within narratives associated with the project. This engagement was open

ended, within it I asked how reading affect into this redevelopment process could begin to nuance conceptions of the impact of urban planning process, and add texture to the development process. Within this initial engagement, I found a dichotomy between the practice of housing developers and planners working within the Yesler Terrace redevelopment, and narratives from residents, activists, and artists pushing back against the changes being brought. The projects and process of residents, activists, and artists seemed to be situated in the affective dimension, whereas planning practice did not. I carry this dichotomy into this engagement. In this engagement I take my initial process and add a formal structure to it. I return to narratives at Yesler Terrace, and some within the larger context of Seattle. I use this case study as a lens for beginning to think about how affect can provide entry points within the planning process to begin to deconstruct this dichotomy.

In bringing projects that are founded in the affective dimension into the urban planning process, I do not participate in a direct comparison. The nature of projects and processes of residents are fundamentally different from the nature of planning practice, and with this in mind, I bring them together in conversation. I am less interested in direct comparison, and more focused on seeing how learnings from projects and processes of residents situated in the affective dimension can begin to add texture to the planning process, and outline future steps for imagining a planning process founded in the affective dimension.

My methodology flows through a few different stages. The first steps of this project, after situating myself within the context of planning practice and affect theory, begins fully situated in the context of the current redevelopment of Yesler Terrace, a long-standing affordable housing site and community in the First Hill neighborhood of Seattle. In 2006, the SHA began a formal process to demolish and rebuild the site, converting about 500 low-income homes to 5,000 mixed-income units. As of February 2017, all residents have left their homes and the SHA is in the process of redeveloping. This project centered around identifying key narratives emerging from Yesler Terrace – projects that aimed to convey the reality of the redevelopment of Yesler, and to hold on to the memories and meaning, to serve as a touchstone when the physical nature of this place is no longer.

I identify two main projects or narratives in relation to Yesler Terrace's redevelopment, the film Even the Walls, the Yesler Terrace Youth Media Project, seeing how they worked to capture and claim memory in the context of complete change. I choose these two projects because they explicitly focus on memory and connection, each working in some function to act as a touchstone for residents of Yesler Terrace in the face of losing their physical tie, the "old" Yesler Terrace, to their memories and connections to place. I choose to focus on alternative narratives to government in that they provide as best as possible, direct experience from residents, direct testimony. Though edited and crafted into a narrative, much of this work is done by experts, Yesler Terrace residents. I use affect theory as an entry point for thinking through the relationship these works have to memory and meaning in the context of place, and in the context of a place that is changing. I watch Even the Walls and the films put together by the Yesler Terrace Youth Media, with affect in mind, seeing how it circulates through the work, and in the context of resident's experience and relationship to place. This initial engagement was freeform, a test, that grounds this engagement.

Through this initial engagement, I saw a dichotomy emerge. With the work from activists and artists, for some of whom Yesler Terrace is home, there was a clear attempt to convey a sense of entanglement between residents, between individual conceptions of self and place, and engage with this intangible nature of affect, reading a sense of meaning into the everyday moments that we often initially view as mundane. Narratives from the SHA, through Citizen Review Committee and Community Council and Workshop reports, to documentation of their processes, though, seemed to be focused on moving forward, on improvements, and on future, better, iterations of this place. Both have merit – the reality is that we are living in a city that is rapidly becoming less affordable, and denser housing is a must. But, in processes of development, displacement often seems to be viewed as a reality, a norm, a given, and in the process memory is being violently erased, individuals and communities are being pushed out, playing in to historic realities of repeated erasure. This project engages with this dichotomy.

In this iteration, I focus the scope of my project to finding entry points to bridge this gap, and to deconstruct this dichotomy. I revisit narratives from Yesler Terrace —Even the Walls, and Yesler Terrace

Youth Media, working to reclaim memory, and to push back against processes of systemic displacement, processes of gentrifying. I engage with them with affect in mind, thinking through, like I do with Yesler, thinking through how affect shapes my own perception of the work, but more importantly how affect is conveyed within participants through memory and relationship to place, time, meaning and identity, relationship to the government (trust), and the materiality of the everyday – to planners and decision makers. These are trends that emerge through my initial work with Yesler, and serve as an organizing and guiding force throughout this engagement.

I use this analysis as a foundation for thinking through this dichotomy that originally emerged in my work at Yesler. Using an outline of the history of planning process, definitions of planning process as a baseline, and the process of the SHA as baseline, I take learnings from Yesler Terrace to outline two entry points for thinking through affect in regards to the planning process.

Affect is messy, affect is complicated, and affect is often difficult to grasp. In doing this work, I do not attempt to convey affect in a linear, clear manner. I do, though try to provide an entry point for breaking down this nuanced theory, and beginning to work it into the realm of planning. This engagement is limited in that it does not provide a complete analysis of the relationship between affect and planning. Rightfully so, it is limited by context. Moreover, it is limited in solutions, I only begin to outline a framework for rethinking. Outlining of steps, though, should come next, and is an important step to rethinking how we plan.

Before moving forward to outline these initial steps, I move through a discussion of the foundations of this work - affect theory, Yesler Terrace, and the planning process. Affect theory, in this sense, provides a grounding point for my frame and lens within this engagement, whereas the planning process and Yesler Terrace provide foundational context and a site of critique.

Foundations
Affect Theory
Affect theory encompasses the idea that at sites of encounter, when two bodies meet (human or non-human) there is an embodied intensity that occurs at a deep sort of sensory level. It is an embodied

intensity that shapes us, and shapes how we move through the world, but it is an embodied intensity that does not make much noise. Silent, but guiding.

Affect, in this sense, refers to the sensations that are deeply felt, but are difficult to describe within the confines of English language. Think of a moment when you hear a loud "boom" and your gut drops. Simply saying "your gut drops" fails to capture the deep sensation that occurs in this moment, there is much more texture and density. Affect allows us to take this moment and unpack it, thinking through how this "boom" could in some small way trigger a different trajectory, a different life force. Affect allows us to think through the interconnection that takes place within this fleeting sensation. I first encountered affect in the summer of 2015, while studying abroad in Lima, Peru. Captivated by the energy of Lima, and entangled in my own questions about the politics and ethics of studying a place as an outsider, I began to grapple with the nature of everyday movements through the world. In retrospect, my fascination with the senses of the city of Lima and the embodied experience of moving through it in part, perhaps, came about from being somewhere completely new.

I have lived in cities, though much smaller than Lima, throughout my entire life. I had been a single entity, an individual, within a multitude before. I was familiar with the sensation of being a part of a wave of individuals moving through a shared but personal space. But there was something about being in a completely new context, an outsider in a new framework, that made the dynamics of city spaces fascinating in a completely different and new way. Experiences that are new, and outside of the frame of the familiar everyday, for me, have been when affect feels most potent, and most accessible. In thinking about this experience now, two years later, what stands out to me, immediately, is the time spent walking from my apartment suite, to the grocery store, to class, to meetings, or to meet friends. I remember specific streets, specific sounds, specific signs, all which now, looking back, hold a sort of confusing and ephemeral meaning for me. I remember a specific intersection – the department store with sparkling dresses clinging to mannequin's bodies, blurs of blue, currency exchanged quickly, benches lining the street in rows, buses weaving past, exhaust blowing, I remember coughing. This intersection was where I first found affect.

At the end of my study abroad program, we were given the space to complete our own research project. I thought about how to use this project to process the past 6 weeks. I thought back to this intersection. I was captivated by the way that energy flowed in and out of the space like waves, by the buzzing and bumping of traffic - an ambient but invasive soundtrack running throughout - in rhythm. As an individual moving through the space, I meandered through the crowd, pushing my way past individual after individual, rushing to make it across in time. As soon as I left the space, the sensory experience calmed down, cooled off, the sounds and vibrations of the space fading in the distance. But for the minute or so that I moved through the space, it was striking. There was a push and pull of intimacy and complete disconnection, close proximity masked by the desire to get in and out, to move on with our days. I had a sense that there was meaning within this, but it was evasive. I became fascinated with how much time I spent in shared spaces, but how little I thought about them. I became fascinated by this notion of proximity in the face of deep separation, about this notion of impacting and shaping trajectories without doing so overtly. This focus, for me, was the beginning of a now two-year sort of fascination with affect.

For my final project I chose to return to this intersection, and another close by that was familiar, but also completely new, an intersection that I moved through when walking to class, when walking to go shopping, or when walking to just to walk. I spent eight hours at these intersections, watching, moving, walking – getting a sense for how energy circulated through the space. I came in, as much as possible, without any guiding questions, and was there to simply be a part of the space, and to feel the embodied experience of being an observer of the space.

This engagement, without my knowing it, centered around affect. I was interested in the encounters that took place within the intersection, and how these meetings shaped future encounters. I wondered whether the encounters that happened at intersections had an impact on where we went when exiting the intersection, whether a small shift in position, or a glance shared could shape or change where individuals went next, or their perspective or position within the world. In this line of thinking, I do not mean to argue that there is a literal shift in perspective or position or trajectory. These impacts, I think, happen less obviously, subconsciously, below the surface. My project, in this sense, fundamentally,

centered on reading meaning into the mundane, questions of how we make meaning, and how we fail to recognize meaning being made. These are questions that emerge when engaging with affect.

Affect is complicated and messy. But this messiness fundamentally shows how multilayered everyday moments are, and how visceral forces operate within each moment at a deep, inconspicuous level. Though difficult to grasp and engage with, especially because it evades the confines of the English language, engaging with affect is necessary in that it allows space for rethinking through how we engage with one another, our surroundings, and brings in a recognition of nuance and interconnectedness.

In "An Inventory of Shimmers" affect scholars Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth work through various concepts of affect. They say,

> "There is no single unwavering line that might unfurl toward or around affect and its singularities, let alone its theories: only swerves and knottings, perhaps a few marked and unremarked intersections as well as those unforeseen cross-hatchings of articulations yet to made, refastened, or unmade."[3]

It is in this spirit that I engage with affect. Throughout this engagement, I hope to begin to get to the root of why I think that affect is powerful, and the underlying ways in which affect can be read into the field of planning. I found the power affect, in some small sense, while in Lima. This is an attempt to delve deeper within this, to take this power and extend it, weave it into everyday practice, and begin to imagine a planning practice based on theory. In Lima, I saw how affect can be a lens for rethinking our engagement with the everyday, for understanding how we are made and unmade as we move through the world. Here, I hope to take this first encounter with affect and begin to imagine a sort of engagement with the built environment that is based on the affective dimension.

Here, Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth point to the idea that affect moves silently, without making noise. And despite being guiding, we are often unaware of the way in which affective memories move through our bodies and flow within encounters. This brings up an interesting question of what it means to engage with the world, what it means to be a being moving through the world, and potentially breaks down dominant conceptions of consciousness and knowledge. Without engaging with the

---

[3] Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth, *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2010), 5.

discipline of psychology, or diving far into the depths of processes of scientific inquiry, affect begins to dismantle the idea that through process and methods of inquiry, we can ever truly know, completely, the dynamics of how we move through the world and make meaning.

This power of this idea is two-fold. On one hand, this points to a question of how, as individuals moving through the world, we are aware of our connection to place. Questions within the realm of planning that consider the sticky, ephemeral dimensions of place attachment. On the other, this points to a difficulty within planning, a question of how to engage with this stickiness within the confines of practice, and within the confines of problem solving and solutionizing.

In the interest of engaging, here, as a first step, within the foundations of affect theory, I focus on questions of consciousness and the body. Gregg and Seigworth open "An Inventory of Shimmers" with a discussion of the power of affect. They say,

> "Affect is founded in those intensities that pass body to body (human, non-human, part-body and otherwise), in those resonances that circulate about, between, and sometimes stick to bodies and worlds, and in the very passages or variations between these intensities and resonances themselves. Affect, at its most anthropomorphic, is the name we give to those forces--visceral forces beneath, alongside, or generally other than conscious knowing, vital forces insisting beyond emotion--that can serve to drive us towards movement, toward thought and extension, that can likewise suspend us (as if in neutral) across a barely registering accretion of force-relations, or that can leave us overwhelmed by the world's apparent intractability. Indeed, affect is persistent proof of a body's never less than ongoing immersion in and among the world's obscenities and rhythms, its refusal as much as its invitations."[4]

"Persistent proof of a body's never less than ongoing immersion in and among the world's rhythms."[5] This is what affect points to, this is how affect begins to deconstruct the notion of a single body separate from surroundings, the notion of a singularly self. Gregg and Seigworth, in this sense, drop us into this notion of becoming, and the affective dimensions of this. We are always situated in place, but this is more than a passive engagement. In being situated in place, we are continuously engaged in affective encounter with place, we are shaped by our surroundings as much as we shape them. When we step on dirt, when

---

[4] Ibid, 1.
[5] Ibid.

we move a chair, we change the make-up of our surroundings, but affect pushes us to consider how that chair pushes back, how the soft cushion of the dirt shapes our next step, and perhaps, shapes our trajectory moving forward. This shaping, these affective encounters, are small, they are incremental, and they are silent, but they make up our engagement with the world. When we begin to consider the affective dimensions of these engagements with the worlds we can see how our bodies co-mingle with place.

In their discussion, Gregg and Seigworth touch on the work of Brian Massumi's, an affect scholar and Associate Professor of Communications at the Université de Montréal. Referencing the ephemeral and difficult-to-engage-with quality of affect, they say, "affect would feel a great deal less like a free fall if our most familiar modes of inquiry had begun with movement rather than stasis, with process always underway than a position taken."[6]. Affect is difficult to engage with in that it is subversive, it pushes back against current conceptions of bodies and identity, and connection, and begins to imagine a new world of operation where sensation and emotions are at the forefront. Affect is difficult to engage with because it is fluid, and it points to a form of knowing that is beyond current conceptions of the way the world works, and perhaps shows the limitation of current conceptions of knowledge and thought. Affect, in this sense, points to the power in thinking through what is beyond our control, or what cannot be known. Affect, in this sense, makes space for a sort of humility, both in conceptions of oneself and in conceptions of others. In the same vein, thinking specifically in the context of affect and urban planning, affect begins to breakdown conceptions of the planner as being able to completely know a community, or completely understand the depth of various dimensions of a context the are engaging with. Affect, in relation to urban planning, pushes us to consider what is beyond the limits of our engagement as planners, currently, and recognize how these limits confine current understandings of relationships within and relationships to the built environment.

Gregg and Seigworth's gesturing to this question of why affect is so difficult to engage with brings in a question of how the structure of our engagement with affect shapes our capacities to engage

---

[6] Ibid, 4.

with the concept. This conversation points to a question of the limits of constructions of time, of constructions of consciousness, and of constructions of rationality, and how these limits emerge within the field of planning. Kathleen Stewart's work, in conversation with Sara Ahmed's helps us to consider how affect is confined by, and pushes back against, these limits.

Kathleen Stewart writes about affect in the context of the everyday. In the opening of her book Ordinary Affects, she immediately pushes for an understanding of the world that does not focus on totalizing systems, but instead looks at how forces, like globalization, capitalism, and so on, circulate throughout lives. She argues that her project is to "bring them into view as a scene of immanent force, rather than leave them looking like dead effects imposed on an innocent world."[7]

She goes on to define the ordinary, characterizing it as "a shifting assemblage of practices and practical knowledge."[8] Ordinary affects, she says, in this sense, are "the varied, surging, capacities to affect and to be affected that give everyday life the quality of a continual motion of relations, scenes, contingencies, and emergences."[9] Ordinary affects are happenings, they're encounters, they're daydreams, expectations, disappointments, relations that "catch people up in something that feels like something."[10]   It becomes clear, when reading Stewart, that when we talk about affect, we are talking about the dynamics of life generally. Interaction, whether with other human bodies, non-human animal bodies, or inanimate bodies, encompasses our every moment, we are never truly alone – we are constantly in states of encounter.

In the introduction to her book, Stewart brings in Raymond Williams's structures of feelings. Borrowing from him, she explains that ordinary affects 'do not have to await definition, classification, or rationalization before they exert palpable pressures."[11] She contrasts these sensations with the "'obvious meaning' of semantic message and symbolic signification," perhaps gesturing to the idea that affect is

---

[7] Kathleen Stewart. *Ordinary Affects* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2007), 1.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid, 2.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Ibid.

"immanent, obstuse, and erratic" as opposed to feelings, which are easier to grasp and translate.[12] Affect gains meaning in movement – movement through "bodies, dramas, and social worldings of all kinds."[13] Affect, in this sense, as I have attempted to outline, is a guiding force, an embodied intensity that stimulates movement and shapes trajectory, but operates almost as a silent force. It follows, then, that affect is fundamentally concerned with our everyday – shaping how we move through the world.

There is something specifically about the manner in which Stewart engages with the everyday that gestures back to conceptions of time, conceptions of consciousness, and conceptions of rationality. Ordinary Affects is, fundamentally, theory through poetry. Within her writing, she weaves through questions of the everyday, of what constitutes ordinary lives, and how meaning is made within them. In her writing, Stewart seems to convey a different conception of time. She slows down, she focuses on the intimate, on the micro. She is explicit about this from opening pages of her engagement. In the first pages, she pushes us to step away from the overwhelming scope of larger processes of globalization. She emphasizes thinking through overarching systems of power in relation to the everyday, how they circulate between bodies, and how they shape how we move through the world and how we relate to one another. Though not explicitly, this move forces us to slow down. It forces us to focus on the intricacies, to think through how larger systems flow through the everyday. Within this, Stewart's writing, and affect theory more generally, speak to what is missed when we move through our everyday. Affect shows us how conceptions of time push us to continuously move forward, and to progress. This focus on time in relation perspective points to other questions that have emerged thus far about consciousness, perspective, and objectivity within our society.

Sara Ahmed expands on these questions of perspective, and objectivity in relation to affect. In "Happy Objects" she talks about angles. She writes, "we may walk into a room and 'feel the atmosphere,'

---

[12] Ibid, 3.
[13] Ibid.

but what we feel depends on the angle of our arrival. Or we might say that the atmosphere is already angled; it is always felt from a specific point. The pedagogic encounter is full of angles."[14]

In Ahmed's discussion of angles, I see a direct connection to bodies, to positionality. We all encounter affect differently, because we all approach an encounter from an angle specific to ourselves and our own position. We encounter affect, and we are conditioned by affect in different ways. In this sense, Ahmed speaks to what Kathleen Stewart pushes for in the first pages of Ordinary Affect, to begin to recognize the intricacies with which affect lends itself to, to begin to understand a world not in the totalizing systems to guide and shape us, but in the way those systems circulate among us. I find this tension within affect as well though, in gestures to the affective dimension I find myself thinking through a web of energy the unites and ties us all together. Perhaps not completely untrue, but part of what makes affect powerful, is the way it situates individual bodies as affective agents moving through the world, it situates bodies as autonomous but interconnected.

Yesler Terrace

In my attempt to understand how affect does, and does not flow through current planning practice, and make steps towards future engagement, I situate my work in the context of the Yesler Terrace redevelopment. Situating myself in this context serves as a constant reminder that the processes that I engage with here are very much real, and a reminder to be cognizant of my own distance and privilege throughout. Additionally, though, Yesler Terrace's redevelopment is a huge process of change within the city of Seattle, and this demands pause and engagement, because with this redevelopment, comes much change, change that directly relates to personal connection to place and identity. In engaging with Yesler Terrace here, I both want to be mindful of the fact that again, this process is very real, but also that it not a simple one, and though I critique planning process and redevelopment process here, there are concrete needs that shape the foundations of this redevelopment.

---

[14] Sara Ahmed, "Happy Objects" in *The Affect Theory Reader 2010,* ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth (London & Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 14.

Yesler Terrace is a thirty-acre affordable housing community in the southern most end of Seattle's First Hill neighborhood, bordering the Chinatown and International District. Most recently, Yesler Terrace was home to five hundred and forty-three families, and roughly twelve hundred individuals. More than eighty percent of the individuals living at Yesler Terrace were non-white individuals of color, and a large majority were immigrants or refugees. In the mid to late 2000s the SHA began the process to redevelop Yesler Terrace. Today, all of the original Yesler Terrace structures have been demolished, and the SHA, along with Vulcan, a private Seattle-based real estate company, have begun redeveloping the site, building a mix of low-income, middle-income, and market rate homes, as well as shared community space and office space that will be leased to an outside organization.

The history of Yesler Terrace is also a history of the formation of the SHA, a public corporation, separate from the city of Seattle, that provides affordable housing for those eligible (SHA). The roots of the SHA began to form in the late 1930s, with the passing of the Housing Act of 1937, and the efforts of Jesse Epstein, a lawyer living in Seattle. Jesse Epstein, while working at the Bureau of Governmental Research at the University of Washington, was in charge of tracking federal programs that could apply locally, and learned of the Housing Act of 1937, which allocated federal funds to support public-housing assistance programs led by local governments. After learning of the program, Epstein began to fight for the creation of a local housing authority in Seattle to make use of federal funds locally. Epstein worked with the mayor, and subsequent mayors, at the time to first establish a local housing advisory commission, but had to gain state approval in order to get funds to begin projects from the deferral government. In 1939, the state legislature passed the Housing Authorities Law and Housing Cooperation Laws that approved the existence of a local housing authority, and allowed for the allocation of a three-million-dollar loan from the federal government to build affordable housing in Seattle. These funds, and the creation of the local housing authority, SHA, more broadly, made the development of an affordable housing project on Yesler Terrace a possibility.[15]

---

[15] John Caldbick, "The Seattle Housing Authority, Part 1 and 2," *History Link,* 2017.

Yesler Terrace was the first project taken on by the new SHA. The site selected for the project, again, was on the southern-most edge of the First Hill neighborhood known as Yesler Hill. The selected site was spanned a 24-block area, and was forty-three and a half acres.[16] The site was selected for multiple reasons. First, the housing stock in the neighborhood was older, and, from the perspective of the SHA, rundown, much like a lot of the housing stock in the city at the time. Second, the site was close to the King County public hospital and to many schools.

As Jesse Epstein and the SHA were beginning to move forward with plans to develop Yesler Terrace, there were approximately twelve hundred individuals living on the site, all of whom would be forced to vacate their homes and find a place to live elsewhere in order to make space for the new development. Existing low-income households were given priority when the homes were built, but within this group only households headed by a United States citizen were allowed to return. Individuals were not given priority to return.[17] This dynamic of displacement for development is one that we see again as Yesler Terrace, today, is in the process of being redeveloped, and one that lingers throughout histories of urbanization, development, and colonial history. Thinking through this dynamic, specifically in regards to place affect is a central idea throughout this paper.

Yesler Terrace was the first racially integrated affordable housing development, though an informal policy limited the number of Black, African, or African American families to twenty-five percent.[18] This was a deviation from the norm of racially segregated affordable housing projects at the time.

In late 1940 Epstein, going against the federally mandated designs that were an attempt to streamline development, began to solicit bids for the design of Yesler Terrace. And in early 1941 the SHA housing selected a construction company, and began construction of six hundred and ninety units. The design was based on Swedish worker housing, rows of single family units. After the completion of

---

[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid.
[18] *Yesler Terrace Youth Media,* 2015.

the units, very few old residents returned, either because they were ineligible because of strict income level requirements that limited the residents to those who were extremely low-income, or because they chose not to. This seems to foreshadow similar dynamics with the current redevelopment, with old residents choosing not to return.

At the point of completion of Yesler Terrace, the United States had entered World War II. A huge amount of industry and workforce was redirected towards the war effort, and there was a need for housing for military families and those supporting the war. In June of 1940, Congress amended the Housing Act of 1937 to all funds for affordable housing development that had not been spent to build accommodations for those supporting the war. In October of 1940, Congress passed the Lanham Act that allowed for the redirection of low income housing funds to similarly go towards building military housing.[19] As a result, funds from the SHA went to building military housing in Sand Point, and the development of new homes in Rainier Valley and at Holly Park. In 1942, the SHA built one hundred and seventy-eight new units at Yesler Terrace that were explicitly for those working to support the war, and military families, making the total number of units over eight hundred.

The structures built in 1941 and 1942 are the structures that existed, and were home to over one-thousand individuals, some over the course of their entire lifetime or adult life, up until their demolition in 2010. There were, though, some changes. In 1960, two hundred and sixty units were demolished to make space for the construction of parts of Interstate 5. This project claimed eleven acres (Caldbick). In 1975, the, now called, Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), began the Target Projects Program, a funding program that provides resources to "modernize" and update affordable housing sites. The SHA was awarded four and a half million dollars from this program. As the beginnings of a process to use some of these funds at Yesler Terrace, the SHA partnered with the Seattle Department of Community Development to for the 1975 Neighborhood Housing Rehabilitation Program to study potential options for the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace.[20]

---

[19] John Caldbick, "The Seattle Housing Authority, Part 1 and 2," *History Link,* 2017.
[20] Ibid.

Today, most of the physical structures of Yesler Terrace discussed throughout this history are no longer there, and the residents living in this place throughout this history are now living elsewhere, either waiting to return or not. Processes to formally develop Yesler Terrace began in 2006 with the First Hill Neighborhood Plan, though the roots of this project can be dated back to 1975 with the Target Projects Program.

The SHA describes the beginnings of this process as an attempt to "replace Yesler Terrace's aging public housing buildings with a new mixed-income community where people from across society can come together to enjoy cultural diversity and high quality housing with nearby amenities."[21] In different phases, the SHA, according to their reporting, has given residents 18-months of notice that they need to relocate, and demolished different sections of Yesler Terrace. According to the SHA, and the Seattle City Council, there is a guarantee that residents can return to the new Yesler Terrace if they would like, but it is unclear whether former residents will be interested in moving back. In films like Even the Walls, which I will engage with more deeply soon, some residents have explicitly said that they do not want to return, that the Yesler that will come to be will not be the Yesler that they once knew and were a part of. This new development will include a mix of affordable and market rate homes.

In 2013, it was announced that through an opening bidding process, the SHA had selected Vulcan Real Estate as their partner on this project. This move was one that seems to fit into the larger character of South Lake Union, a neighborhood that is rapidly changing to meet the needs of "market- oriented bioscience and e-commerce."[22]

Throughout the process of planning to and actually redeveloping Yesler Terrace, the SHA "engaged residents and community partners through [their] Citizen Review Committee." Membership included "residents, affordable housing and smart growth/sustainability advocates, city agencies, and service providers."[23]

---

[21] "Yesler Terrace Development Plan," *Seattle Housing Authority,* 2011.
[22] Charles Mudede, "The Twilight of Yesler Terrace," *The Stranger,* February 6, 2017.
[23] "Yesler Terrace Development Plan," *Seattle Housing Authority,* 2011.

As of today, Yesler Terrace has been completely demolished, and the SHA is working with Vulcan to develop 5,000 new units. Of these 5,000, 561 will be replacement units for those displaced from Yesler Terrace, for individuals or families who are considered "extremely low income" – earning 30 percent or less of the area median income (AMI) – 290 units will be built for households that earn 60 percent or less of AMI, 850 units will be built for residents with incomes at or below 80 percent of AMI, considered to be "workforce housing," and 3,200 homes will be priced at market-rate. Some progress has been made so far. Kebero Court, which includes a six-story apartment building, and three town home buildings, was completed in 2015. The site has 103 apartments in total, and is a mix of one, two, three, and four bedroom units, 83 of which are subsidized and available to those making 30 percent of AMI or less, and 20 of which are for households making 60 percent of AMI or less. The Baldwin Apartments, replacement housing for those displaced by the redevelopment, was completed in 2014, and has 15-one bedroom apartments."[24]

This history is admittedly incomplete. As someone who has never lived in Yesler Terrace it is impossible to completely tell the story of the reality of this place. And through reading, and even writing, this history it becomes clear that one thing is missing, this lived reality of place, the reality that for many people this was, is, and may always be home. Throughout these laws, amendments, shifts in funding, and new developments, what falls to the wayside in retelling this history is the reality that while all these changes were happening people were living there. People were living their lives. People were embedded in this place, being shaped by this place, and shaping this place in return. Again, this is why this engagement is so important, and why reading affect theory and place attachment into concerns of development and other planning phenomena is fundamental. As we think through affect in regards to this history the linear telling becomes nuanced, depth is added, and the crucial reality that this is a lived experience that is dynamic and powerful becomes more apparent.

---

[24] "Yesler Terrace," *Seattle Housing Authority,* 2017.

This history, though incomplete, makes clear that my engagement is situated specifically in the context of gentrification and displacement, as is any engagement within the sphere of urban planning, because when we deal with space, we are always dealing with legacies of colonialism, native erasure, and racial segregation. This is especially the case in Seattle.

Planning Process

Though I engage directly with the processes of the SHA specifically, this project is tied to a critique of the larger foundations of urban planning practice.

Urban planning, as a process, emerged with the industrial revolution. It arose out of a desire to recreate cities with the foundation of enlightenment principles, to "produce the desired object," to ultimately achieve "the good city."[25] It also arose out of a desire to have the technological methods to expand cities, mirroring the expansion of industry at the time. We see this in thinkers like Ebenezer Howard, who pushed for urban decentralization, strategic zoning, and integrating nature and greenbelts into the city.

Susan S. Fainstein, in her book The Just City, provides an outline of how current methods and processes of urban planning within the Northern Atlantic region emerged from these roots. Her analysis, largely, serves as the foundation for my engagement with the planning process. The timeline she lays out provides a lens for thinking through how planning historically, has engaged with the affective dimension, and how this foundation shapes current engagement with the affective dimension. I use Fainstein here as my primary foundation for planning process, recognizing that this may be a limit to my engagement. Fainstein does, though, provide a well rounded frame of reference for thinking through the planning process as it has come to be today, and by bringing her work into conversation with some foundational texts in my planning education, and the context of the Yesler Terrace planning process, I situate myself within the context of my urban planning education, and use this as a platform for critique.

Fainstein explains that at the time of the industrial revolution, as planning process first emerged, it was a process of experts defining and designing plans for urban spaces that they felt were in the public

---

[25] Ebenezer Howard, *Garden Cities of To-Morrow,* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2015), 2.

interest. There was a "moral foundation" of process in a concern for citizen's interests, but the content of these interests was largely taken for granted. Experts decided what was in the best interest of those who they were planning for.

With this in mind, reformers pushed for a more independent planning process, a separation of government administration and policy making, to best avoid bias and corruption on the part of the "expert" planners. This push was founded in a belief that expert urban planners can develop policies that best serve the "public interest" without being influenced by their personal positionality, and by their own interests. This claim of a disconnect between planning practice and positionality is an assumption that contemporary social science has continued to push back against. Gillian Rose's work "Situating Knowledge," is an example of this.

At this point, urban planning process was not founded in any explicit theory. In 1935, Karl Mannheim developed the first specific urban planning theory in his book Man and Society in the Age of Reconstruction. He outlined his belief in democratic planning process, in public interest, defined by elected officials, driving urban planning process. He outlined a bureaucracy subject to democratic control. In doing so, Mannheim outlined a foundation for the "direction taken by academic planners in the post war period"[26]

This direction included a shift from planning as craft, from planning founded primarily in urban design, to planning as scientific activity. Scientific in that with precise information, a planner can outline a "very sensitive system of guidance and control."[27] This seems to be the foundation of planning as process, this process being a thing independent of the thing that is being planned.

A large part of this transition between planning as a primarily a design profession, to largely, a "social science," was founded in theory developed at the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania. Theorists at these two schools,

---

[26] Susan Fainstein, *The Just City* (Ithaca: Cornell Press, 2010), 60.
[27] Ibid.

"laid out [a] rational model and methods for testing policy alternatives. They incorporated the thesis that general goals could be stipulated in advance within a democratic political process, and that the formulation of the means to reach those goals and the process of implementing those means could be conducted impartially by disinterested appointed officials."[28]

This approach, an approach that lingers today in current conceptions of planning process, is founded in a belief in democratic processes of governance, as democratic decisions guide strategy. Fainstein points out an important assumption here, worthy of critique. This approach, she says, presumes that "goals democratically derived [are] inherently equitable," that democratically decided upon goals represent the interests of the individuals they affect. I will return to this later. This approach also presumes that the means for achieving democratically determined goals can be discovered scientifically[29]. I will return to this, also.

As these methods increasingly valued scientifically determined processes of planning, essentially rationality, within the sphere of planning there was also an increased value placed on comprehensive approach to planning, whereas Fainstein embraces incrementalism. There was an increasing belief that approaches to planning that look at a certain scope as a whole, can bring together varied elements, or dynamics, of urban spaces, that often operate as separate processes or "bureaucracies."[30]

These changes began, as said, with Mannheim's original advent of a theory of urban planning. Ultimately, his approach solidified the importance of contextual approaches to planning process, pushing back against the notion that plans and processes can be repeated regardless of where they are being applied. Fainstein argues that, in doing so, Mannheim undermines the usefulness of quantitative approaches to urban planning. She says, "Mannheim proposes instead the use of reason and comparative analysis rather than a formally rational methodology. Such approach is necessarily value-laden and calls for various forms of knowledge."[31] Though he pushes for this more interdisciplinary, relational approach,

---

[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid, 61.

in many ways Mannheim reinforces past formulations of the planner as expert. Fainstein argues that he "expects an educated elite, working within his flexible definition of reason reflection, to plan on behalf of society at large."[32] This notion of the planner as sole expert is one that begins to be questioned within the scope of the history of planning practice.

Alan Altshuler critiqued the emphasis planning theories at this point had placed on comprehensiveness, arguing that this requires planners to rank interests into a "single set of goals."[33] This critique echoes concerns that emerged following Mannheim's planning theory, and theories out of the University of Chicago and Pennsylvania. In the 1960s and 1970s questions began to emerge around the claims of planning to rationality and comprehensiveness. These concerns were underscored by theorists who "regarded the presumption of disinterestedness as a mask for the power of property developers and upper-class groups."[34] These critiques were reinforced by the advocacy planning movement within the field working to force "planners and urban policy makers to become more concerned with the impacts of decisions on the politically powerless – especially those displaced by highway and urban renewal programs."[35] Historically, planning, and more directly zoning, has been a method of control of populations, specifically communities of color. This push back serves as a point of rupture within this history, a push within the planning profession to think through concerns of impact, of unintended consequences, and of reinforcement of histories of oppression.

This push also, in some ways, to consider the moral stakes of planning. A push to plan with a moral foundation, to think about remedying disadvantages produced by "poverty and racial discrimination.[36] Fainstein points to questions of whether planning can work to achieve this goal, questions of whether the "structural underpinnings" of planning make equitable planning only a reality if

---

[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid, 62.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid, 62.

there is a complete transformation of the structures of planning practice. This seems to be a question that remains unanswered. I engage with this question, albeit tangentially, throughout my analysis.

Today, there is working being done to develop what Fainstein calls "middle-range theory."[37] This theory is one that "embeds planning practice within a larger, post-positivist theoretical framework" that recognizes that removed objectivity is not a possibility.

Faistein leaves us here, in a description of current planning practice as relational, one that begins to shy away from objectivity, values process, and, perhaps, recognizes impact and histories of oppression and in a discussion of her own theory of urban justice, a form of justice based on democracy, equity, and difference.

<div align="center">Planning Practice Today</div>

The Yesler Terrace Citizen Review Committee, a citizen board established to craft recommendations for the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace, put together a glossary of urban planning and design terms to help create a level of shared understanding among actors engaged in the redevelopment process. They begin with a definition of planning and the role of the planner. In the specific context in which this paper operates, within narratives and processes of displacement in Seattle, this definition serves as a baseline for understanding current planning process. They say,

> "In addition to generating their own data, planners draw upon the work of others to create a comprehensive overview of the community. Once planners have conducted their analysis, they develop strategic alternatives for solving problems in a coordinated and comprehensive manner. These alternatives will guide future development based on the established goals and the systematic analysis."[38]

Here, we see Fainstein's "middle-range theory" embodied, a process that in some ways recognizes limits on objectivity and need for embeddedness, but perhaps a process that is still limited. A process that struggles with rationality, and with positionality.

If we take this process outlined as a baseline for current practice, a few important steps emerge. First, the planner needs to be familiar with a community, in whatever way possible they need to know the

---

[37] Ibid, 63.
[38] "Yesler Terrace Background Report," *Seattle Housing Authority,* 2008.

community. Within my planning education, I have seen this referred to as "getting to know the soul" of a place. Once this analysis is done, we move into the next step, developing alternatives options, multiple plans, to solve a problem. This is a problem that has been determined from the onset, a problem that guides this entire engagement and planning project from fruition. These strategies are compared, assessed, perhaps brought back to the community, and are revised, until one strategy is selected because it is the most "coordinated and comprehensive."[39] Within this process goals and guidelines for future projects and development are established. Essentially, then, planning process involves (1) establishing a problem, though how this problem is established is not yet clear, (2) getting to know the community and space you are intervening in, (3) developing clear and comprehensive strategies for rectifying or remedying this problem, and (4) selecting the most clear and most comprehensive strategy to adopt as an action plan for intervention. Within this, there are various forms of community engagement and soliciting feedback, though they are not explicitly named. Within this as well, there is an establishment of precedent, of future goals and guidelines for further urban development and projects.

My central focus here is to engage with the second step of this process, the getting to know the community and space element, and to think through how this shapes steps three and four. There are a multitude of examples for getting to know the space that you are intervening with as a planner — Kevin Lynch's "walk around the block," William Whyte's method of spatial observation, interviews, community meetings, surveys, and so on -- all of these models, largely speaking, aim to get at "the soul" of a place, "the soul" of a community, whatever that may be.[40][41] The Seattle Housing Authorities outreach plans for Yesler Terrace employ many of these "strategies" but also go beyond this in many ways. They conducted community workshops centered around key concerns at Yesler, hold regular Community Council meetings, and run major Yesler redevelopment decisions through a Citizen Review Committee, all of which are translated into multiple languages.[42] In many ways, these processes have centered

[39] Ibid.
[40] Kevin Lynch, "The Image of the City" (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960).
[41] William Whyte, *"The Social Life of Urban Spaces"* (New York City: Project for Public Spaces, 2001).
[42] "Yesler Terrace Background Report," *Seattle Housing Authority,* 2008.

community voices, and they are an example of a community engagement process that in many ways is progressive, and is pushing back against histories of planning practice that use community involvement as a token. Still though, this dichotomy emerges between planning practice and narratives from the community. Still though, this process does not seem, I argue, to be enough.

I go on to describe two examples that push attempts to "understand" a community and space further, and delve deeper into sensations that reside in the affective dimension. They are examples of attempts to bring phenomenology and storytelling into the urban planning process, and are attempts, again, to embraces the nuances of relationship to place and the built environment.

Phenomenology and Storytelling

In "Street Phenomenology: The go-along as an ethnographic research tool," Margarethe Kusenbach intervenes specifically in processes of ethnography, processes of "interviewing informants and observing 'naturally' occurring social settings, conduct and events," processes used within the urban planning process. She discusses shortcomings of current practice - she questions the role that positionality and comparison play within observations of spaces, and almost circles around concerns of affect. She gestures to questions of how to ensure that residents sort of "insider" perspective is included within these processes, and how to ensure that space is left for the "saturated" and mundane reality of almost "mysterious" connections to place and space. She gestures, almost, to affect, without ever naming it.

Kusenbach's project here is one situated in phenomenology, a practice that has long engaged with relationship to place. She argues, though, that many conceptions of phenomenological practice fail to fully realize the "primacy of place in our environmental experiences and practices."[43] Here, she advocates for bringing the role of the environment and the meaning of place in everyday lived experience into the purview and focus of those working within phenomenology. In doing so, she pushes for broadening conceptions of "how individuals comprehend and engage with their physical and social environments in

---

[43] Margarethe Kusenbach, "Street Phenomenology: The go-along as an ethnographic research tool," Ethnography 3, no. 4 (2003): 456.

everyday life."[44] She does this through introducing the idea of the 'go-along' and uses this as tool that engages with and incorporates "transcendent and reflexive aspects of lived experience as grounded in place."[45] This, I argue here, is affect. In understanding and incorporating the transcendent and reflexive aspects of lived experience of place, we are fundamentally engaging with the affective dimensions of experience of place, and of connection to place. Kusenbach's go-along represents an attempt to incorporate the affective dimension into processes of phenomenology, and an attempt, when read in the context of planning practice, to engage with residents in a way that allows space for incorporation of the affective dimension.

Kusenbach names specifically how current processes of phenomenology - ethnographic methods of participant observation and interviewing - are limiting. With participant observation, she discusses concerns centering around positionality and comparison. She describes her own experience researching the Gilmore Junction in Nebraska. She includes field notes in the initial stages of her research, observations taken with little knowledge of the context with which she was engaging. She dissects this, saying that her first set of field notes clearly show that she knew "next to nothing" about the neighborhood, and explains that throughout it becomes clear that she is making sense of her observations by comparing it to other contexts she has lived within.[46] As she spends more time embedded within the context of Gilmore Junction, she does gain more familiarity with the flow of the neighborhoods and with the dynamics, both physical and social, of the area. Her observations, though, are still limited. She says,

Any outsider's view of a setting that lacks a local vantage point necessarily remains superficial, revealing more about the observer's own standpoint than anything else. Yet even when informed by intimate local knowledge, observations of natural settings can be problematic. Our research team learned through trial and error that independent, solitary observations – even when done as insiders – are not well-suited to access local culture as it unfolds through other members' experiences and practices.

---

[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid, 459.

Echoing the dilemma that distant or novice observers run into, we also found that the detailed observations of well-immersed researchers similarly emphasize, instead of overcome, their independent reference points."[47]

Fundamentally, what she is circling around here is positionality, and the questions of objectivity that come with practitioners leading outreach and engagement, and more largely, decision making processes. This is something that, through Fainstein's analysis, emerges as a point of concern within the planning process. Kusenbach's work represents an attempt to engage with this struggle and concern.

Kusenbach points to additional limitations in her discussion of participant observation, and of interviewing. In her participant observation discussion, and within the piece broadly, she touches on an idea of mystery within relationships to the place - mysterious dimensions of the relationship and limits that this creates. A gesturing almost, to the ideas of affect as circulating below the surface of our engagements within the world, silent but guiding. Limits of interviewing relate to this in some ways. Kusenbach explains that the narrative dimensions of interviewing, and the structure of the interviewing situation often constrain the response that these forms of engagement allow for. Narrative styles of communication can be limited as a method for sharing experiences, and interviewing formats often are static, and completely separated, physically and emotionally, from the environments from which the interview content relates. The nuance, the murkiness, and the complexity of the mysterious nature of relationship to place are often lost.

Her model of a go-along is an attempt to engage with these limitations, and imagine an alternative ethnographic mode of operation. She outlines a method, when working within a specific space or place, of walking through the area with residents, without much initial direction, and discussing their relationship to the place - open ended, spatially specific conversations situated in place. She outlines five ways in which this process provides unique "access" to insights about space, as compared to participant observation and interviews: (1) the perception of the individuals for whom this is home is in some ways

---

[47] Ibid, 460.

brought forward - we can better see how individual's perception is shaped and filtered "in situ" and begin to de-center our perspective as observers, (2) texture is added to spatial practices, (3) links between place and life histories emerge, (4) the "social architecture" of places emerges in more nuance - complex webs of connection are made more visible, and (5) this process allows for an exploration of the social realm.

There is a lot here, and my project is less to engage with these outcomes in depth, and more to engage with this the process of the go-along as one attempt to include some engagement with the affective dimension, the affective realm, in urban planning practice. Kusenbach attempts to do this, and in some ways she is successful. She begins to push for a more nuanced engagement with space, for more nuanced methods of engagement with places that are meaningful and personal. In some ways, though, she is still limited -- she struggles with positionality and perspective, and struggles with getting at this "mystery" of relationship to place. I will return to these questions in my analysis.

In "Out of the Closet: The Importance of Stories and Storytelling in Planning Practice," Leoni Sandercock similarly gestures to the affective dimension, and begins to outline methods for engaging with the mysterious dimension of relationship to place that Kusenbach touches on. She does so specifically in conversation with the planning process, whereas Kusenbach is responding to phenomenological and ethnographic practices generally. In "Out of the Closet" Sandercock responds to a sort of "marginalizing" of the story as a site of meaning within the social sciences, and specifically in the planning field. She argues that the story is at work at all times, and is of much importance in the planning practice, research, and teaches, and specifically in multicultural planning. She outlines elements of stories to demonstrate how story is already evident throughout the planning process, and how story can and should be used by planners within their engagements with community. In this, she fundamentally argues that planning is "performed through story."[48]

She outlines five elements of stories - (1) the temporal or sequential framework, (2) an element of explanation or coherence, (3) some potential for generalizing, (4) the presence of recognized, generic

---

[48] Leoni Sandercock, "Out of the Closet: The Importance of Stories and Storytelling in Planning Practice," Planning Theory & Practice 4, no. 1 (2003): 13.

conventions that relate to "an expected framework, plot structure and protagonists," and (5) moral tension. She demonstrates how these elements flow through the planning process, in the sense of how planning embodies recognizable plots of conflict between white colonizers and indigenous communities (land being taken away), coming to a place to find a sense self and freedom, or "the golden age lost." We see these plots in writings about communities losing places that are meaningful in the face of development, in moments that embody a sense of loss of place, and narratives of progress. She demonstrates other ways in which these elements flow through planning, specifically in the context of moral ordering within discussions of the built environment - of impersonal forces (like capitalism, and "the alienation of urban life") that function as protagonists, but also in how these forces are embodied by individuals ("wicked developers, … noble community activists").

Using this demonstration as foundation, Sandercock moves into a discussion of how the role of the story is central within planning, though perhaps not always "consciously." She makes a claim, specifically, within this that the planning process is a form of persuasive storytelling. She says,

> "Planners are both authors who write texts (plans, analyses, articles) and also characters whose forecasts, surveys, models, maps, and so on, act as tropes (figures of speech and argument) in their own and others' persuasive story. A crucial part of [James Throgmorton's, a planning theorist,] argument is that this future-oriented storytelling is never simply persuasive. It is also constitutive. The ways in which planners write and talk shape community, character, and culture. So a critical question for planners is what ethical principles should guide and constrain their efforts to persuade their audiences."[49]

Part of the ethical dimensions of these considerations, is ensuring that storytelling within planning is for those for whom planning decisions affect. Sandercock says, in part, this means "literally expanding the language of planning to become more expressive, evocative, engaging, and to include the language of emotions."[50] Here, she points to the importance of her intervention within my work in this context.

Sandercock's discussion of the role of story within planning practice goes beyond initial claims of stories importance and begins to push for a planning realm that is fundamentally intimate, personal, and

---

[49] Ibid, 20.
[50] Ibid.

situated in the affective dimension. Stories do this. When we speak of stories, we are speaking of personal narrative, of personal constitution, of our sense of self formed by interaction and embeddedness with our surroundings. In this claim she, first, situates planning practice as something that is fundamentally engaging with identity and second, points to greater care for the implications of this, and for examining how planning practitioners can more effectively use story to with community. Without gesturing to affect, she positions understanding planning practice's relationship to story as a method for beginning to engage with the affective dimensions of lived experience of place and the built environment. She gestures also, to the personal nature of planning for the planner themselves, and how storytelling can begin to be a method for examining one's own positionality in this work. I'll return to this, and affects role in this, in later analysis.

Kusenbach and Sandercock, in their own ways, demonstrate work that is currently being done to engage with this sort of mysterious connection between place, identity, and lived experience, and its role in the planning process. They situate interventions of this sort as beginning to imagine engagements with community that are better founded in the reality of individual and community life, and a planning process that is better equipped to found planning decisions in the lived reality of those for whom they affect. They also, though, point to the reality that this work is difficult, and is unfinished. They gesture to the affective dimension, but not directly, and within my work I intervene in this, bringing affect theory and planning process directly together within the context of Yesler Terrace in the aim of continuing and building upon this important work.

Yesler Terrace Narratives
Even the Walls

Even the Walls was my first introduction to Yesler Terrace. I watched it in the early stages of my work, as a first engagement with Yesler. In doing so, unintentionally, my first orientation to Yesler Terrace was explicitly founded within the stories of Yesler, a unintended nod to Leoni Sandercock.

Even the Walls centers itself within the context of the mundane reality of living in a place, the mundane reality of home, but shows this mundane reality in the context of complete change, in the context of redevelopment, and questions of an impending future that is potentially out of the hands for

whom this place is home. Through the voices and stories of different Yesler Terrace community members, the filmmakers take a process that is sweeping, multi-faceted, and explicitly political, and show the personal, the intricacies of moments that make Yesler home, the moments whose meaning belongs explicitly to those who are embedded within them. Swinging on cricketing swings, back and forth. A father and son sharing tea. Doors slamming, home's entered. Sitting on a front porch talking on the phone. These meanings are personal, they are intimate, but they also transcend individual experience. These are moments that are ubiquitous. They are moments that define life. Moments that many share, moments that are not specific to Yesler, but moments that in this context are so specific. Moments that have more meaning perhaps than it initially seems.

It becomes clear within the opening minutes of Even the Walls that this is film explicitly for the residents of Yesler Terrace. A "time capsule", a touchstone of memories in the context of a place that holds many, but a place that will, explicitly, no longer exist.

The Yesler Terrace that emerges throughout the film is marked by notions of temporality, and more generally, by time. We see a Yesler Terrace has existed in this capacity for over seventy years. A Yesler Terrace that is now changing. We see a Yesler Terrace in this film does not physically exist, a "neighborhood is disappearing," physical structures that are now gone (Sarah Kuck 2017). Even the Walls provides a small glimpse of the meaning that this place holds for those who lived there. We see mundane moments, memories in action – children running, playing tag, tea shared, fishing trips, phone calls, front stoops, laughing. These memories hold meaning for the residents in this film that I will never understand. They are intimate, they are personal, embedded in lives' lived and life trajectories that I am not a part of.

My project here is not to understand these narratives, but to see how their telling gets at the relationship between place and personhood. Place and memory. Place and identity. Fundamentally, my project here is to engage with how the affective dimension emerges through this telling of Yesler Terrace. Within this engagement, and in the engagements that follow, I strive to be cognizant always of the role that distance plays within my engagement. I am not a Yesler Terrace resident. I am conditioned by the

distance between me and this place, and am conditioned by experiences of place within my own life. I am, in some ways, a voyeur, and throughout this engagement work to ensure that the reality that this is a place that for many is inextricably tied to their reality, their personhood, and their sense of self and community connection. They moments portrayed throughout Even the Walls mean something for residents that I will never understand completely. I do not seek understanding here. I do not seek to tell the stories of those who lived, live, and will live at Yesler Terrace, or the new Yesler. I am interested her in how affect flows through this reclamation of memories of Yesler.

The film opens with sounds. Familiar sounds, rubber tires hitting concrete, buzzing of car engines, buses, creaking swings. Sounds give way to telling of stories. Still a backdrop.

We hear from Selaay, a twenty-one year resident, his entire lifetime, about the shreds of stories at Yesler. About memory, loss, moments ripped away. We hear from Audry, of how she came to Yesler Terrace, "by way of Cajun country ... here a long time." We hear of moments of sadness mixed with moments of joy, and of hopefulness, of "fighting to stay," and of giving up.

We hear from Marty, a resident of Yesler Terrace, who talks of Seattle changing, of Yesler Terrace being a "billion-dollar hill," of growing up on Jackson street, watching people coming to Yesler Terrace, and leaving. Of only having "rocks and beer," of paying for sins, of returning, of changing trajectories, of past hurt.

We hear from Keshia, about Yesler today, the Yesler in progress, not being the Yesler Terrace she once knew. Of people giving up, of physical pain, teaching oneself how to walk, of phone calls on the porch, watching cousins play, just watching, of peace. We hear from Julissa and Isiah. Of favorite places lost, of excitement, of known futures, known moves, others unknown.[51]

We hear snippets of life from Yesler, but we never hear the full story. This resembles Kathleen Stewart's writing in some ways, moments of deep intimacy that are mundane, that hold meanings that are deep below the surface, meanings that are guiding, deeply personal, and sometimes hidden. In some

---

[51] Saman Maydani and Sarah Kuck, *Even the Walls,* Film, (2015, Seattle).

ways, though, we must also be cautious when engaging with stories of this sort, or perhaps more so, in engaging within the world generally. We operate in narratives, but as Ahmed points to we approach these narratives at angles. We are all positioned, angled, in our own ways, but, also, these narratives are angled. This does not make them less real, but it is also clear, for example, that in Even the Walls, we are seeing snippets of a reality that is not our own, snippets that, perhaps, are an attempt to facilitate an affective sort of relation, both for the residents and for outsiders.

Yesler Terrace is changing; we see this through Even the Walls. We see this through the perspective of residents. Through stories of loss, stories of anger, stories of fear, stories that transcend emotions, that are confusing, that are nuanced. Stories of Yesler Terrace.

Yesler in the Details

Even the Walls tells the story of Yesler through details. With this comes a focus on the materiality of the everyday, and the meaning that lies within the mundane reality of everyday life. Objects within the film seem to provide a vessel for slowing down, and thinking in detail. Objects, for me, have been central to thinking through the role affect plays in conception of self, and connection to place. Connection to objects provides an avenue for thinking through how we are shaped by encounters that are not often obvious, though still, perhaps tangible. They provide a way to think about how repeated encounters, or small moments, can have impact that doesn't initially resonate, but that shapes trajectories.

Objects in Even the Walls seem to be a connector. In one scene, we see a father and son, Hussein and Armand sharing coffee. The film then moves us through different scenes of individuals sharing tea and coffee. We see a mother brushing their child's hair, Marty, surrounded by his belongings. Each resident in their own context, often their homes, surrounded by their things. Sarah describes these objects as touchstones, relating this back to Selaay describing the loss of Yesler as taking away the memories of a place. She describes picking up a sweater after ten years, the memories brought back, facilitated through touch -- this is affect. She says they had to treat these objects importantly. This fundamentally is a story about moving. When you move, you chose which objects to bring with you, which to leave behind.

This engagement with objects within Even the Walls has interesting implications within the planning sphere. The physicality of affective connection to physical matter, to "things," can be extended to considerations of affect and the built environment. Throughout Even the Walls, residents point to the physical dimensions of Yesler, and the connection that has come through sharing place with them. They talk about this in the context of coming changes, in the context of the reality that the physical dimensions of Yesler will no longer exist. When we think of affect within this context, and of the connection of place that is then lost, what implications does this have for sense of self, for identity? And how does this reconceive the weight, or the impact, that planning decisions carry?

In the "Worlding Refrains," Kathleen Stewart says,

> "Affect is the commonplace, labor intensive process of sensing modes of living as they come into being. It hums with the background noise of obstinacies and promises, ruts and disorientations, intensities and resting points. It stretches across real and imaginary social fields and sediments, linking some kind of everything. This is why there is nothing dead or inconsequential in even the flightiest of lifestyles or the starkest of circumstances. The lived spaces and temporalities of home, work, school, blame, adventure, illness, rumination, pleasure, downtime, and release are the rhythms of the present as a compositional event – one already weighted with the buzz of atmospheric fill."[52]

"Everything," she says, "depends on the dense entanglement of affect, attention, the sense, and matter."[53] She talks of bloom spaces, of compositions of life, rhythms within a score, bodies as musical instruments, navigating it all. In Even the Walls we feel affect vibrating, humming along with "the background noise of obstinacies and promises ... of intensities and resting points."[54] We see this in Hussein and Armand sharing coffee, we see this in Matthew taking children at Yesler on a fishing trip, moments of shared joy, moments of intimacy. We also see this in moments of perhaps anger, moments of heartbreak, of forced disconnection. Moments where Selaay talks of memories being destroyed, moments where Keshia talks of never returning. Individuals navigating a composition that they have little control over, a composition that in some ways is determined by political action, by capital interests, needs, by narratives of progress.

---

[52] Kathleen Stewart, "Worlding Refrains" in The Affect Theory Reader 2010, ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth (London & Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 343
[53] Ibid.
[54] Ibid, 340.

Affect provides a way for thinking through how meaning is made within this, how forces circulate to shape and change meaning. How a changing physical space is so intimately wrapped up in identity, in personhood. How people have shaped this place, but too, have been shaped in return.

Time Within Even the Walls

When introduced to this film, I was told that it is "dripping in affect". In the first few seconds of the film, and in the weaving of moments, stories, trajectories, sensations, and relations throughout the twenty-seven-minute film that follows, it becomes so clear how this is so. Yesler Terrace is introduced through sounds. First, sounds of the city scape. Car engines buzzing, rubber tires hitting pavement, wind. Sounds that are familiar, sounds that are specific to Yesler Terrace. Then, a swing creaking back and forth. Watching from behind as a child swings back and forth. Jumping off. Entering home, the door closing in our faces. A reminder.

These sounds show Yesler. They are Yesler. When I spoke with Sarah Kuck, one of the filmmakers she said this choice is Yesler expressing itself. Yesler is a character in the film. Through moments of sound filled silence we see Yesler as it is.

The film moves slowly. Sarah says this, in part, is to allow space to process, to step back, breath through the narrative. Sarah says, "Yesler is nothing if not mundane" and through the film we see this. Through quiet moments mundane meaning emerges.[55]

Engaging with affect requires a shift in temporality. Slowing down. Spending time. Thinking through the minutia of life – thinking about where we usually do not attribute meaning. Even the Walls does this. Moving slowly, taking time, we become attuned to the meaning circulating through sitting on your front stoop on your phone, watching children play. Of a white van driving away. Of moments shared over tea. There is meaning here.

There is something uncomfortable about this, though. For me, as the viewer, I was constantly aware of how time was moving in the context of the film - I noticed when I was 5 minutes in, twenty in, when I was a few minutes from the end. There is a sort of double-meaning that emerges in conceptions of

---

[55] Saman Maydani and Sarah Kuck, *Even the Walls,* Film, (2015, Seattle).

time and affect in this regard. Engaging with affect requires a sense of lingering, a pause. A slowing down to notice the sounds and the sensations that mingle within our everyday, and that guide us as we become through the world. But affect also requires a recognition of the velocity with which our becoming happenings, the speed with which the world operates. It requires a recognition of the potentiality for change within a moment, the hum of a forward force operating beneath the surface, and a meaningful engagement with chance. This emerges within Even the Walls. Moments move forward and connect to one another, cars hum in the background. A bloom space.

Yesler Terrace Youth Media

The Yesler Terrace Summer Youth Media Program is a seven-week program where teens use photography and video as a lens to engage with the history of Yesler Terrace and their community, and examine the impact this redevelopment will have on this community. The program centers around the community within Yesler Terrace and the Central District. The Central District is an area that is rapidly gentrifying. Historically, the Central District neighborhood was a center of community, with 60 percent of residents identifying as either black, African, or African American. It is important to note, briefly, that this, in many ways, is a result of racist roots of planning practice, as those who were black, African, or African American were restricted from purchasing property in areas north of the Central District. According to the most recent census data, the percentage of black, African, or African American individuals in the Central District is down to 20 percent.[56]

The program centers around the community within Yesler Terrace and the Central District, a neighborhood in Seattle with its own histories of systemic displacement and gentrification. In 1822, William Gross bought 12 acres of land from Henry Yesler. This land became a settling point for the black community in Seattle, and the Pacific Northwest more broadly. This is not a narrative wholly of choice, though. Housing ordinances and bank practices prevented people of color from living, and accessing loans to purchase homes, restricted the areas that folks had access to living in. These ordinances were, in

---

[56] Dan Kroman, "A Fading Community," *Crosscut,* 2013.

large part, why the Central District historically has been a predominately black neighborhood, though this is rapidly changing.

The Yesler Terrace Youth Media Project, the product of the Yesler Terrace Summer Youth Media Program, focuses on these issues of gentrification and forced displacement through the lens and perspective of the youth in the program, the youth for whom this is home. On the Yesler Terrace Youth Media homepage, they say that, in doing so, this work acts as an "archive concerning this redevelopment."[57] This is a commitment we see as well in Even the Walls, a commitment to produce something for residents, and in many ways by residents, and a commitment to serve as a touchstone for those who are a part of this changing place, for those who will not return, or for those who will return to a completely different place.

Affect emerges within the work of the Yesler Terrace Youth Media Project in its relationship to time, identity (and memory), and trust. Time, similar to Even the Walls, in the sense that places that quickly changing places speak to a relationship between temporality and place. Identity in the sense of changed perceptions of place with changes in landscape, and most importantly the role this plays in identity. Trust, finally, in questions of how trust is built and how trust is lost. Looking at these three elements within the context of affect provides an entry point for thinking through how affect begins to broaden current conceptions of planning, and deconstruct notions of the built environment.

I focus specifically on three pieces of work from the Yesler Terrace Youth Media – their work includes many photographs, videos, and stories – a film called "Yesler's Promise: An Inevitable Change," a film called "Our Voices (Volume 3)", and "Kids Speak," a compilation of videos in which youth who are a part of Yesler Terrace Youth Media talk about the three biggest issues they see with the redevelopment. I chose the two films because they combine discussions of resident's reality of home within this changing reality, with perceptions of this change – working through promises from the Seattle Housing Authority, perspectives and positions of private developer Vulcan, all while centering the stories,

---

[57] *Yesler Terrace Youth Media,* 2015.

the realities, of Yesler Terrace residents. I chose "Kids Speak" because it centers the voices of the youth behind Yesler Terrace Youth Media – within the segments we hear from them their personal perception of the Yesler Terrace redevelopment.

Time within Yesler Terrace Youth Media

Affect takes a single moment and exposes layers of meaning. In doing so, affect pushes us to think about our relationship to time and temporality. Moments of encounter stimulate an embodied intensity, but one that is quiet, one that does not make much noise. One that operates below the surface, guiding, shaping. How do we begin to understand affect in our environment, affect in the way we move through the world? We slow down. We think through the intricacies of our everyday. For some, for many, we unpack the privileges that shape us taking things for granted, we see how systems circulate through our every moment.

In an article about artists work to push back against the widespread displacement currently occurring in Seattle, Jen Graves, former Art Critic for the Stranger, wrote about this. Touching on the work of artists working to reclaim memory in the Central District, and the work of artists-in-residence at Yesler Terrace she writes,

> "Artists will not be able to reverse gentrification, loss, and displacement – or the
> promised deporation of millions of immigrants. But, when a new normal is
> bearing down on a place art can become a call to stay and look as long as we
> possibly can, so that nobody, later, can get away with telling us nothing was ever
> there."[58]

There's so much here. She touches on histories of erasure that the United States is founded on, and the role that planning now, as practice, has in reinforcing this erasure. At the heart of this statement, though, lies the crux of the power of the work of Yesler Terrace Youth Media. Yesler Terrace Youth Media operates as a "call to stay and look as long as we possibly can," to hold on to the memories of a place, to see how this place shapes, and changes, and becomes along with those embedded in it.

Identity

---

[58] Jen Graves, " Seattle Artists Race to Document Cultures Gentrification Is Erasing." *The Stranger,* November 30, 2016.

In the film "Yesler's Promise: An Inevitable Change," Yesler Terrace Youth Media speaks with Ya Pham, a resident of Yesler Terrace. Ya Pham, they say, like many residents, is reluctant to move. His kids were raised here, they lived here all their lives, his family, very deeply, is connected to this Yesler Terrace. They talk about this, saying residents "planted their seeds of life at Yesler, and watched them grow ... to watch their plants be uprooted and destroyed is far too much to expect from longtime residents."[59] In planting your seeds of life in a place, the place, it seems, becomes a foundation for this life – a stabilizer. Memories, moments – the affective sensations and connections – that shape our everyday and the way we move through the world – are tied to this place.

Redevelopment, or perhaps more aptly, displacement, necessitates adding nuance to this connection to place, and the relationship affect has within this connection. In "Yesler's Promise," the filmmakers include mention of a quote from a Vulcan employee, who said that they envision Yesler Terrace becoming the next South Lake Union, an area in Seattle that once was home to a large immigrant population, and is now the center of tech and health industry in Seattle – home to Amazon, Fred Hutch, and Vulcan. South Lake Union is a neighborhood of displacement.[60] Today, we only see remnants of what it once was. Largely, we see a narrative that tells us "that nothing was ever there."[61]

In these sweeping conversations of perceived progress, gentrification, and systemic displacement, affect draws us back to the intricacies of individual experience, a reminder that these processes condition our own bodies, and the bodies of others, though in varying ways. Within "Yesler's Promise" the filmmakers focus on this, talking about their own perception of self in the context of a place that is changing based on a system that is outside of their control. They talk about expression, saying that with these changes – naming explicitly, rich white people coming in – it changes how "[they] feel towards oneself," they question how they will express themselves and how they will interact with people who are

---

[59] *Yesler's Promise: An Inevitable Change,* Yesler Terrace Youth Media*, 2016.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Jen Graves, " Seattle Artists Race to Document Cultures Gentrification Is Erasing." *The Stranger,* November 30, 2016.

different, with people who are coming to this place, viewing it as new, without knowing what was there before.[62]

In thinking through the implication of the Vulcan staff member's statement that their vision for Yesler is a second iteration of South Lake Union, the youth of Yesler Terrace Youth Media go to South Lake Union with Yesler resident Lete Kidane. In moving through the neighborhood, they ask, whether they would belong in the new Yesler Terrace.[63]

It is so clear when watching these films how place is linked to identity. We know this, within the planning discipline place attachment is widely recognized, and, largely, we are able to recognize that positionality shapes perspective and identity, place and physical location being a part of this. We see this in ideology, in politics, and in common discourse. Affect, though, as I have gestured to throughout, takes this deeper, and this, I think, is what is communicated through Yesler Terrace Youth Media broadly. Sara Ahmed touches on this. In "Affective Economies" Ahmed talks about love, and emotion – essential connection – to generally, as not being simply "within" or "without", but as forces that "create the very effect of the surfaces or boundaries of bodies and worlds."[64] If we read Ahmed in here, in thinking through self, place, and connection in the context of complete change, this relationship between identity and place, between community and place is underscored. Change, as the youth all point to, experts of their own experience, disrupts identity. Affect, in this way, and the voices of the youth behind Yesler Terrace Youth Media, gesture, here towards histories of definition of identity through hierarchies of power – identity shaped by outsiders, outside forces, controlled by those in positions of power – identity defined through systems. Yesler Terrace Youth Media, throughout this discussion, uses individual experience as a lens to tell the systemic reality of the world we live in. This, I think, is affect.

This question of identity harkens back to Jen Graves' gesturing to memory. How is this identity that forms through affective encounter linked to memory? And how, perhaps most importantly, is this

---

[62] *Our Voices (Volume 3),* film, Yesler Terrace Youth Media, 2015.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ahmed, Sara. 2004. "Affective Economies." Social Text 22, no. 2 (2004), 117.

memory linked to physical place, to the sensory elements of being embedded in place? When this memory of place is disrupted, when the physical elements of place change drastically, how does this memory change? And how does this change in memory disrupt individual and community identity? Change is inevitable within urban spaces, my project here is not to negate the need for change and progression forward, but with changes of these sorts these are questions that need to be at the forefront. These are questions brought up in the work of Yesler Terrace Youth Media.

Trust

In watching the videos on the "2012 Kids Speak" section of the Yesler Terrace Youth Media online archive, a common question of trust emerges.[65] In the videos, the youth share three main concerns with the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace. Almost all of them bring up the question of trust, trust for the Seattle Housing Authority, gesturing often to questions about relocation, about information that has not been shared, and about promises that have been retracted without recognition. In talking about affect and the soul, Nietzsche thinks through the differences between positive and negative affects. Nietzsche argues that the soul is a bundle of wills – of stronger and weaker desires – and how these wills play out, in relation to one another, shapes action. Jonathan Flately works through similar ideas in thinking about affective mapping as shaping trajectory.[66] Sara Ahmed, too, thinks through this in relation to place. Sara Ahmed tells us that what makes us "move", or what makes us "feel" builds a connection to place. She discusses this in the context of a conversation of how objects become "sticky" with affect, how we grow attached or connected to objects, and how objects become a part of us in this sense.[67] The same could be said for opposite sensations, sensations like distrust. Encounters that stimulate negative affects, these make us "feel," though in a different regard, push us, perhaps, to disengage, to distrust, "move" us in the opposite direction, away. Affect in this sense provides an entry point, among others, for thinking through distrust as a product of injustice, thinking through relationship to institutions as

---

[65] *2012 Kids Speak,* film, Yesler Terrace Youth Media, 2012.
[66] Jonathan Flately, *Affective Mapping* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).
[67] Ahmed, Sara. 2004. "Affective Economies." Social Text 22, no. 2 (2004), 117.

produced through encounter, tangible or not. This circulates through the conversations within the films produced by Yesler Terrace Youth Media.

In *Ordinary Affects*, Kathleen Stewart emphasizes thinking through overarching systems of power in relation to the everyday, how they circulate between bodies, and how they shape how we move through the world and how we relate to one another. Reading affect into this relationship between trust, I think, begins to provide an entry point for thinking through the relationship between the SHA and Yesler Terrace residents that Yesler Terrace Youth Media focuses on here. This, also, seems to be where Nietzsche, in some part, is helpful. Trusting relationships, I argue, are based on affective dimensions. What sort of stimulates positive affects, perhaps, moves us to trust, whereas what stimulates negative affects moves us away from trust. The filmmakers at Yesler Terrace Youth Media, again, hone in on this relationship. Delina, a resident of Yesler Terrace and member of the Youth Media Project, explains that though residents have been promised they can return, they are hesitant to believe this, because in the past, they have heard promises that "don't come back," that don't become reality. Liban, another member of the Yesler Terrace Youth Media Project, touches on this as well, saying that residents need guarantees. Yohanna, another Yesler Resident and project member, says this explicitly; "we never know, they could be lying."[68] If affect is what circulates among us to move us towards and away, affective encounter needs to be there to build trusting relationships. A promise is just a promise, belief and investment in this promise is built through affect.

Liban talks about this in the context of the gardens at Yesler Terrace. He says that one the main issues, or questions that lingers, with the impending redevelopment, is whether the residents will have the space for their gardens. Questions of whether gardens will remain a reality with the new Yesler circulate throughout these three pieces of work from Yesler Terrace Youth Media, bringing with them related questions of space, and whether space will remain.

---

[68] *2012 Kids Speak,* film, Yesler Terrace Youth Media, 2012.

Mama Fatouma, a community organizer form Yesler Terrace, speaks to this point. She says, it is good to have a "new house, but the way they [the SHA] rebuild it is not good." She questions how, with no backyards in the new high-rise buildings, they will "stay in backyards and cook and drink coffee." She says, "we don't have space, we don't have no home."[69]

Dynamics of the physical environment circulate through these three works. Concerns similar to Mama Fatouma's circulate – whether there will be enough space for the activities that for residents, make this place their home – the moments that we see, too, in Even the Walls. Moments watching children play from the front stoop, moments spent gardening, growing literal seeds in the place where, for many, their seeds are planted, spending time sharing coffee – moments that, again, create connection, constituting the self.

The physicality of affect is something that I have gestured to without, but it necessitates a more careful conversation. In narratives circulating throughout Yesler, there always seems to be a sense that this place is special – special for the residents for whom this is home, but also special in terms of the norm of affordable housing. Very different from the Pruitt Igo model that has been critiqued for some time, Yesler, as much as anything else, has been defined by the amount of space. We see this Even the Walls, and we see this in the films produced by Yesler Terrace Youth Media, through residents, through the emphasis on gardens, on time spent, together, in community, outdoors.

Within the "Kids Speak" section of the Yesler Terrace Youth Media project site, many of the youth mentioned the high rises that are currently being built at the new Yesler. They talk of loss of space with the high rises, with this new development creating a "different atmosphere," and questions around how separations of income, and mixes of income will change the reality of their experience at Yesler.[70] This, for me, as someone separate from the redevelopment, provokes questions of visibility and affect, of how this stark disconnect between previous physical realities of Yesler, and the current model of redevelopment. This signaling to high rises is more than just a push back against change, it is the reality

[69] *Our Voices (Volume 3),* film, Yesler Terrace Youth Media, 2015.
[70] [70] *2012 Kids Speak,* film, Yesler Terrace Youth Media, 2012.

of losing something that, for many, was a crux of affective connection to Yesler, space. And though these new, different, buildings may have some sort of shared space, gardens, play grounds – this affective dimension of the Yesler that has been a physical reality since the early 1940s, will largely be gone, memories only remaining.

Memory seems, here, to be a product of affective relationships. With spaces gone, memory is all that remains, and this memory circulates, but without a physical dimension, as we saw with Selaay's telling in Even the Walls, this memory loses density.

Analysis
The Everyday

Affect theory, and especially affect theory read in the context of Yesler Terrace, demonstrates the importance of lingering on the context of the everyday, and on the power of mundane interactions within this. These considerations emerge within planning, but through my engagement with the history of planning process, and with the narratives throughout the projects at Yesler Terrace, I argue that this engagement is somewhat flattening, and fails to consider the true depth and texture of the everyday, the power of mundane interactions, and seemingly simple interactions.

In The Practice of Everyday Life, Michel de Certau pushes for a consideration of the everyday as a site of meaning making, rather than a passive engagement. In doing so, he pushes for a recognition of the power of the mundane. He frames his investigation as one that centers around, "the way in which users - commonly assumed to be passive and guided by established rules - operate," to situate the everyday not as an "obscure background of social activity," but as a site of production. He writes, "the making in question is a production, a poiesis -- but a hidden one, because it is scattered over areas derived and occupied by systems of production."[71]

Within The Practice of Everyday Life, de Certau introduces theoretical methods for penetrating the obscurity of the everyday, making it possible to articulate its meaning. Here, though, I push for affect as model for thinking through the everyday as a site of active meaning making.

---

[71] Michel de Certau, *The Practice of Everyday Life,* (Berkeley: University of California, 3rd edition, 2011), 12.

Planning is fundamentally centered around the everyday. When we intervene in the built

environment we are intervening in a backdrop that shapes and engages with individuals who are

constantly embedded in place, moving through their everyday. The process of engaging with community

to get a better understanding of the space in which we are intervening in is, in some ways, caught up in

the everyday. Through processes of participant observation, interview, community meetings, we attempt

to get a better understand how the built environment circulates within and shapes individuals and

communities everyday. We are interested in the processes that are mundane, in the way in which a

specific stoplight, a sidewalk, a bike lane, for example, can change an individual's relationship to a space,

the way they move through it, and so on. This engagement though, is often limiting. In some ways, these

processes do recognize the everyday as a site of meaning making, but in others, this engagement is still

considered to be passive. There's a depth that is lost, a nuance that is not engaged with, a whole host of

sensory embodiments that fail to be recognized.

This is what Kusenbach points to in her discussion of the limitations of interviewing and

observation. Specifically in regards to interviewing, she points to the limitations of context, of the

physical and social environment in which an engagement takes place. She says,

> "Sit-down interviews are primarily static encounters in which talking becomes
> the center of attention. Any other activity is usually perceived as a distraction
> and pushed into the background. The structuring and emphasis of the interview
> situation not only discourage 'natural', that is, context- sensitive reactions of
> the interviewer and interviewee, they also magnify the dialectical relationship
> between the participants instead of promoting a shared perspective and a more
> egalitarian connection. In short, the particular interactional dynamics and the
> physical constraints of most ethnographic interview encounters separate
> informants from their routine experiences and practices in 'natural'
> environments."[72]

Here, I extend Kusenbach's critique of the interviewing process to a more general consideration

of engagements with the everyday. Yes, planning is interested in connections that circulate through the

everyday, and the mundane, but if we consider the processes by which these engagements with the

---

[72] Margarethe Kusenbach, "Street Phenomenology: The go-along as an ethnographic research tool," Ethnography 3, no. 4 (2003): 462.

everyday occur, we can begin to problematize them, and understand how they limit a reality of the everyday as muddled with sensory meaning, meaning that is opaque and ephemeral. In doing so, my engagement here begins to gesture to a question of whether the fundamentals of planning are incompatible with engaging with the affective dimension. This is a question that I will engage with in more depth later, but one that circulates throughout.

Perhaps the most tangible way to demonstrate the limits of planning engagements with the materiality of the everyday -- or the "mutually constitutive relationships between people and the material world," is to consider discussions of the everyday from affect scholars, and throughout Even the Walls, and the films created from the youth of Yesler Terrace Youth Media, and compare them to processes, definitions, and documents centered around the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace produced by the SHA.[73]

Kathleen Stewart's *Ordinary Affects* engages directly with the sort of ephemeral quality of the everyday, and with the relationship between individuals and the built environment. She pushes for a consideration of larger, overarching, organizing processes of the global world we live in (globalization, neoliberalism, and advanced capitalism are her examples) in terms of how the ebb and flow and form the ordinary. She pushes for a consideration of the ordinary as "a shifting assemblage of practices and practice knowledges, a scene of both liveness and exhaustion, a dream of escape or of the simple life."[74] Even in this initial statement, Stewart makes a potent statement for the power of the everyday, the everyday as a site worthy of careful engagement, and as a site where systemic forces gain their shape, and shape meaning (but also where these forces are subverted). She almost embodies Foucault in this sense, thinking through force and power as emerging at sites of encounter, between bodies.

Throughout her book Stewart demonstrates how to think through the everyday, and the ordinary, in this sense - as an intermingling of bodies, of forces, as an assemblage. She mingles through various topics, stories, glimpses at a life, but a constant that runs through is the question of the power of the

---

[73] "Yesler Terrace Background Report," *Seattle Housing Authority,* 2008.
[74] Kathleen Stewart. *Ordinary Affects* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2007), 1.

ordinary, meaning through the ordinary. She has one section called "Live Wire" where she talks about self-composition. She says,

> "Like a live wire, the subject channels what's going on around it in the process of its own self-composition. Formed by the coagulation of intensities, surfaces, sensations, perceptions, and expressions, it's a thing composed of encounters and the spaces and events it traverses or inhabits.
>
> Things happen. The self moves to react, often pulling itself someplace it didn't exactly intend to go."[75]

The subject as a live wire - moving through a space and channeling what it going - begins to deconstruct individuals as separate from the built environment, as constituted bodies, beings, moving through space. She points to an idea of becoming, a notion that Deleuze, by way of Nietzsche, advocates for. This, in many ways, reinforces de Certau's conception of the everyday as a site of poiesis, a site of meaning making. In the everyday according to Stewart, bodies are shaped, but so are environments. Individuals are constituted by the everyday, but in turn, they also constitute the everyday. This points to a question of whether this is observable -- and whether this is conveyed through interview, through story, or through observation. I will return to this later.

Earlier on in *Ordinary Affects*, Kathleen Stewart describes the ordinary, beginning to move towards a definition of the everyday. She says, "the ordinary registers intensities - regularly, intermittently, urgently, or as a slight shudder."[76] These intensities, one could argue, are affective encounter, affect in action. If this is affect, then, and what we are aiming at when we form knowledge of a community, and understanding of a space we are intervening with, how do we engage with intensities that are intermittent, urgent, or slight? My project here is not to answer this question, necessarily, but instead to begin to problematize current conceptions within the planning sphere of outreach and engagement as potentially being unable to do this meaningfully. The first question, how to understand this, is an important next step, one that will take more exploration. Kathleen Stewart does this, in some ways, within Ordinary Affects.

---

[75] Ibid, 72.
[76] Ibid, 10.

Stewart builds on this description of the body as constituted and becoming later in *Ordinary Affects,* in a section entitled "The Body Surges." She says,

> "The body surges. Out of necessity, or for the love of movement.
> Lifestyles and industries pulse around it, groping for what to make of the way it
> throws itself at objects of round perfection.
> The way it builds its substance out of layers of sensory impact.
> The way the body is submerged in a flow and both buoyed and carried away. It
> strains against recalcitrant or alien forces, or it drifts downstream, eyes trained on
> the watery clouds overhead.
> Agency lodged in the body is literal, immanent, and experimental. It no sooner
> starts out than it gets sidetracked or hits a wall and then holes up, bulks up, wraps
> itself up. It might pull itself together or pull a veil around itself, build a nest of
> worn clothing redolent with smells of sweat, or cheap perfume, or smoky wood
> fires burrowed into wool. If it gets sluggish, it might call for sweet and heavy
> things to match its inner weight, or for salt and caffeine to jolt it to attention."[77]

Kathleen Stewart, in her writing, takes the everyday and lingers, deconstructing it and rebuilding through details. We see this here. Though just one approach for engaging with the everyday through affect, in reading her work we begin to see how affect provides a lens for thinking through the flow of energy within ordinary spaces, and how this constitutes and shapes individuals, and shapes the worlds they are embedded within.

This lingering, to circle back, is one that we see in Even the Walls, and in Yesler Terrace Youth Media. Through different methods, each project seems to push back against notions of time and speed within engagements in the built environment to entertain the notion of the materiality of the everyday in a more meaningful manner. Time, within planning, seems to be a key limitation for meaningful engagements with the everyday - deadlines constrain us, and therefore shape process. Lingering subverts this. Affect pushes us to linger, it pushes us to consider what we're missing. It shows us that when we are so focused on content, on answers to a question, on understanding how engagements with the everyday can provide information to solve a problem, we miss the rich, textured, conversation that we are continually having with the world around us.

---

[77] Ibid, 9.

We see glimmers of this in Even the Walls and Yesler Terrace Youth Media. Though seen through the lens of editing, these projects are directly from residents, showcase their lived realities and their stories, and in this intimate engagement provides a depth that allows for demonstrating connection to the affective dimension. We see this in conversations about Yesler about the gardens, the moments spent outside watching younger Yesler Terrace residents play soccer. We see this in moments of shared coffee, hair brushing. Meaning is made in the mundane. A meaning that encompasses our everyday. A meaning that is perhaps lost when we engage with the everyday in the confines of a planning question, or with surface level observations of behavior in the built environment. We see this in the SHA's reports from their community engagement processes. The "Citizen Review Committee" has been the SHA's main mode for engaging with community members throughout the Yesler Terrace redevelopment, along with other separate processes like regular community council meetings, and workshops. Throughout these, members gave feedback on proposed plans by giving each component a score from 1-5. At other meetings, residents were asked what their favorite components of Yesler Terrace are and were, and what their least favorite were. They were asked, then, what they'd like to see in future development at Yesler Terrace - in the "new" Yesler. All community workshops took a form of this sort - with residents being asked which components of a certain part of Yesler terrace they liked and did not like, and what components of future plans they liked and did not like.

This is all important within the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace. With the SHA's citizen review community, community council, and community engagement more broadly, we see, comparatively to other housing authorities, a progressive engagement process within a project of urban change. But still, in juxtaposing the narratives presenting in the two projects I engage with here, and in the work of Kathleen Stewart, a question lingers of whether these processes can capture the mundane meaning within the everyday, the complexity of our conversations with the world around us. How, then, can processes begin to engage with this? These current engagement strategies, though forward moving and perhaps similar to Kusenbach and Sandercock in this domain, are not enough, they still reinforce this dichotomy between

planner and people that emerged initially. Perhaps, then, this points to a need for the consideration of structural change.

There are though, other efforts in the planning field to further this engagement with the everyday meaningfully. One such example is Mark Purcell's work Excavating Lefebrve. In this, Purcell takes Lefebrve's idea of the right to the city, and applies it, thinking through what it would mean to have decision making processes at a city level be founded in this right. Purcell, early on, explains the Lefebrve's concept of the right to the city, saying,

> "The right to the city reframes avenues of decision-making in cities: it reorients decision making away from the state and toward the production of urban space."[78]

Within this statement, we see the power of Lefebvre - he fundamentally argues for a political system founded in the everyday, drawing decision making practices back to their impacts, back to lived experience, and forcing a recognition of the everyday and the ordinary as meaningful. In outlining a political system founded in the everyday Purcell, by way of Lefebvre, makes a claim for decision making founded in the experience of urban inhabitants, a political system in which all members of an urban space have a say in decisions that affect them. He gives an example of a potential Boeing investment in Seattle - saying, in this case, all who have "a right to Seattle would have the right to participate centrally in an investment decision of a corporation like Boeing that would affect the urban space in Seattle."[79] There's a radical claim to interdependence that lies within this. He points to questions of potentially problematic notions of this claim, questions of equity, and of pragmatics. There are others too, the question of who has claim to the right to a city is a reminder that historically these spaces did not belong to those who colonized them, and of who can make claims to a city - questions that need meaningful engagement that are outside the bounds of this engagement. But within this, we see a recognition of the fact that everydays are intertwined together, intertwined with space, and with larger political realities.

---

[78] Mark Purcell, "Excavating Lefebvre," GeoJournal 58, no. 2 (2002): 101.
[79] Ibid, 102.

This, I argue, is something that affect allows for, and a key way in which affect theory begins to deepen conceptions of what it means to understand the everyday. The right to the city, in this sense, outlines a political system, a sphere of urban governance, that is perhaps founded in a recognition of the the power of the everyday, and the power of affective connections within this.

For the right to the city to be realized though, engagements with affect theory need to come first. In order to understand, as best as possible, how urban inhabitants relate to space, and to changes in space, we need to engage with the affective dimension, because as I have demonstrated throughout, the lingering and depth that affect theory provide show us that these relationships gain their texture and meaning through the mundane. Current methods of planning practice do not have the capability to meaningfully engage with the nuances and depth of entanglement that encompasses the ordinary. Incorporating the sort of depth of engagement that affect theory allows for into the planning process provides a lens for beginning to realize a sort of urban governance founded in the right of the city.

Problem Based, Comprehensive Planning

In this discussion of the everyday, I outline elements of affect theory and of projects from residents that can provide learnings for planning practice to better engage with the materiality of the everyday, and the meaning of mundane engagements. In many ways, though, this discussion is incomplete without considering the structural dynamics that potentially limit planning practice from being able to get there. I outline these here in hopes that rather than serving as an end point, they serve as the first steps for imagining structural change, and truly realizing a planning practice that is founded in the affective dimension.

Throughout Susan Fainstein's illustration of the planning process, we see a process that continually struggles with claims of objectivity, of rational decision making separate from, or in light of personal positionality, and claims of comprehensiveness. At its conception, planning practice function with an assumption of objectivity in terms of decision making and analysis on the part of the planner. Through the 1960s and 1970s, with pushes from advocacy planning, we see considerations of how this sort of objectivity is founded in assumptions, and founded, fundamentally, in inequity. Even in the face of

this, though, today, we see a planning process that is still struggling with these same claims to objectivity, rationality, and comprehensiveness. We see a planning practice that prioritizes understanding, answers, and comprehensive decision making processes.

In her work "Situating Knowledge" Gillian Rose describes all knowledge as partial, as situated, produced in specific circumstances that shape it. She describes her own experience as a feminist geographer, and a specific interview within a research project that she describes as a failure, a moment that provoked further questions surrounding the situated nature of knowledge, and of how to navigate one's own positionality in the research process.[80] Here, I extend her work, and her questions, to the realm of urban planning.

"Situating Knowledge" stems from this failure, and within her work Rose questions whether reflexively examining and being aware of one's own positionality in order to not skew results throughout the research process is possible. She describes this failure as one that must be aware of as researchers and theorists, and something that does, definitely, limit work, but one that also propels further inquiry in how to advance methods to account for this failure of reflexivity. She describes this failure as a site of productivity, potentially, a push for "further radical strategies for situating feminist geographical knowledge."[81] Again, in extending her work to the urban planning realm, I argue for an understanding of planning knowledge and planners engagement with communities and space as particularly situated, but push for realization of these "radical strategies" within the planning field.

In concluding her work Rose says, "I think power and knowledge are inextricably connected… I therefore worry that my work may exclude or erase, I worry about its effects" (2007, 306). She goes on to say,

> "We cannot know everything, nor we can survey power as we fully understand, control or redistribute it.What we may be able to do is something rather more modest, but, perhaps, more radical: to inscribe into our research practices some

---

[80] Gillian Rose, "Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivity's and other practices," Progress in Human Geography 21, no. 3 (1997).
[81] Ibid, 306.

absences and fallibilities while recognizing that the significance of this does not rest entirely in her own hands."[82]

Within this, Rose, though indirectly, begins to gesture to the importance of questioning claims of rationality, objectivity, and comprehensiveness within the urban planning process through the lens of affect theory. There are sort of two prongs to this analysis and this questioning - first, deconstructing claims of rationality, objectivity, and comprehensiveness as failing to recognize the need for reflexivity and the reality that all knowledge is partial and situated, and second, the recognition of what is missed in the midst of pushes for comprehensiveness, and objective analysis in the planning process. My main focus here, again, is engaging in the second step of the planning process outlined in earlier sections, in conceptions of how planners engage with, and "understand" the dynamics of individuals and communities embedded within a certain space.

In her claim of her own failure, Rose demonstrates holes within the research process, broadly, and the inability of the researcher, or in this case the planner, to ever close the gaps that these holes create. My engagement with the narratives and processes of Yesler Terrace's redevelopment underscore this. In Even the Walls, and in Yesler Terrace Youth Media, we see processes that linger, prioritizing the detail and the moments of mundane meaning. This meaning, ultimately, is what shapes relationship to place, and to space, as I have demonstrated throughout, and given this, need to be the foundation of the second step of the planning process, and engagements with the goal of "understanding" a space and community in which we are intervening. Rose problematizes this further. As she argues, all knowledge is situated, all knowledge is partial, when we engage with places as planners we are conditioned by our own positionality. But in many ways, as she demonstrates, we are also limited by our process. As planners, we chose a specific methodology for engaging with a place. We may chose many - interviews, walks around the blocks, community meetings, and so on. In this though, we are aimed at choosing methods that present "clear and comprehensive strategies" for understanding place and community. We prioritize and

---

[82] Ibid, 319.

situate our understanding as clear, as comprehensive, and in doing so, fundamentally begin to remove the planning process from those for whom it affects.

Sara Ahmed speaks of this directly in relationship to affect. She writes, again, about angles - "we may walk into a room and 'feel the atmosphere,' but what we feel depends on the angle of our arrival. Or we might say that the atmosphere is already angled; it is always felt from a specific point. The pedagogic encounter is full of angles."[83] As Rose points to, there are angles inherently, we are all positioned, but within planning practice, I argue that we further angle ourselves. In outlining a process that is clear, comprehensive, and objective, we limit the reality of experience of place that fits outside of these bounds, and isn't considered productive or useful in the confines of these constraints. Further problematizing this, is the question of whether much of the complex and nuanced affective relationship to place that is demonstrated throughout Even the Walls and the work of Yesler Terrace Youth Media fits into the confines of these processes.

I circle back, in this questioning, to the processes of the SHA, through the Citizen Review Committee, Community Council meetings, and community workshops. In comparing the experience, perspective, and knowledge shared from residents within the SHA's process to that of Even the Walls and Yesler Terrace Youth Media, we see overlaps. There is discussion of the importance of coffee, time spent together in gardens, and the open nature of Yesler Terrace in both scenarios, but much of this planning material is devoid of the sort of nuanced, fundamentally affective, connection to place, the questions of changing identity and memory, and moments of lingering and mundane meaning that we see through Even the Walls and Yesler Terrace Youth Media. Part of this comes from editing on both ends, but this lack of inclusion of the affective dimensions is limited by this push for comprehensive, objective engagement and process.

We are limited, even more so, in this sense, by the overall scope of the planning process as a response to problems, and as providing solutions. In this sense, while balancing looking for clear and

---

[83] Sara Ahmed, "Happy Objects" in *The Affect Theory Reader 2010,* ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth (London & Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 14.

comprehensive approaches to understand place and community, we are also doing this in the confines of looking for solutions, looking for answers to specific questions, and in doing so, we miss the continual rich, nuanced, and textured conversation individuals embedded in space are continually having with the world around them, and that we, as planners are having with the world we are embedded within. Affect theory shows us that this conversation is meaningful, and without engaging with it seriously within the planning process we fail to effectively center planning process and planning decisions on the lived reality and lived experience of individuals embedded in place.

There are pragmatic elements to the confines present in current planning practice, and even in my own analysis I am hesitant to completely deconstruct these confines. Rather than being a limit for deconstruction, though, I'd like to use this hesitation to serve as a reminder that we are always positioned and constrained by process. That being said, though, in order to imagine a planning process that truly engages with the affective dimension meaningfully, where this initial dichotomy is deconstructed, we need to begin my going to the roots of the planning process, the lenses and constraints that I have discussed here, and step outside of them, imagining alternatives. My project here is to demonstrate the need for this, though this deconstruction and rethinking will take time and space that I do not have here.

Regardless of deconstructions and reconstructions of the planning process, planners will always be conditioned and limited by their own positionality. Rose points to the fact that we can never get away from this, our knowledge is always situated, specifically positioned.[84] This is especially relevant within the planning sphere, as urban planners continuously engage with communities that they are not a part of. In addition to being limited by our own process, we are limited by our own position, and this needs to be at the forefront of planning concerns. Without being addressed, assumptions are made, and our knowledge is further limited. Even the Walls and Yesler Terrace Youth Media, though again through the lens of editing and fundamentally different from the planning process, are from the perspective of residents, and the sort of affective engagement within these projects come from being intimately

---

[84] Gillian Rose, "Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivity's and other practices," Progress in Human Geography 21, no. 3 (1997).

embedded within a specific place and a specific context. Urban planners, perhaps, will never be able to achieve this level of intimate connection, and this is important to acknowledge and take seriously. As Rose says, this recognition is not a stopping point, but a demonstration of a need for further engagement, for further questioning. As planners, we need to be more mindful of this limitation, it needs to be at the forefront of our engagements, in order to begin to, again, deconstruct this dichotomy and imagine a truly affective planning process.

Conclusion

In this paper, I am limited by my scope. In focusing so heavily on projects that are situated in the affective dimension, I do not engage with as much depth in the nuances of the planning process. In future iterations, if this work continues, I will do this, and begin to understand more deeply how structural elements of the structure of planning shape our engagements with the everyday, with relationship to place, and the affective dimension more specifically.

These projects also function differently from the planning process. This has been a fundamental argument in my work here, I believe that as planners we need to learn from these projects, and take these projects and learnings seriously. With that in mind, however, the Yesler Terrace that I have engaged with has been through the lens of others' engagements, and others' editing, and in my analysis of how affect flows through these works I am conditioned by this. I recognize that this limits my work, I recognize that my own knowledge is situated and conditioned by my own positionality. I have strived to be mindful of this in my work, and remain aware of my own positionality without centering myself in this work. As Gillian Rose points to, there is no way to remove yourself and your position from your work and knowledge production, and I will continue to struggle with this moving forward.

That being said, this project stands as a push for a more nuanced planning process, a process that is founded in a recognition of the affective elements of connection to place. This project, in some ways, has been removed from the material realities of what this process will look like. The reality is that planning historically has been a tool to control populations, to shape individuals' conceptions of home and identity, and to control communities and individuals of color. Although today as we see through

Fainstein, we have pushed to realize a planning practice that is founded in democracy, and in justice, I question whether this can be realized without an engagement directly with the affective dimension.[85]

Planning is a process that fundamentally should be tied in lived reality of place - we see this through Fainstein's conception of planning, and through Kusenbach and Sandercock's discussion of methods for engaging with conception to place. In order for planning decisions to be effective, they need to be founded in the realms with which they engage. I have demonstrated throughout that this realm is one that is seeping in affect, one that is nuanced, ephemeral, and oftentimes evasive. I question whether current planning practice can engage with this without flattening it. This requires pause.

In the narratives and projects of Yesler Terrace, we see this nuance. We see this through process of lingering and open engagement, and through reflection. We see this through processes that center residents voices, residents experiences, and take this seriously. We see this through processes that recognize the importance and meaning of the mundane, everyday realities that shape individual identity.

In Even the Walls, Selaay says,

> "I'm very proud to grow up where I grew up ... I know what it has done for me. Growing up in low income housing you go through shit with people who are going through shit, and it builds you up. All I have of you is memory – that memory is also attached to certain places you grew up in. when you take away those places that we grew up in, that memory starts to fade as well … it thins out that connection."[86]

Memories and identity are intimately connected to space. When we intervene in space, we intervene in these memories, and fundamentally in individual and community identity. This requires care. As cities continue to change, grow, and develop, we need to take care in regard to this. As planners, we need to work to ensure that memory is honored, and that memory is not lost in the face of these changes. Affect, in these narratives, provides just one avenue for doing this. Though this analysis is founded in affect, at its core, it pushes for a recognition of the force of planning as one that shapes individual experience, and individual identity. It pushes for a conception of planning that recognizes the power of memory, and

---

[85] Susan Fainstein, *The Just City* (Ithaca: Cornell Press, 2010).
[86] Saman Maydani and Sarah Kuck, *Even the Walls,* Film, (2015, Seattle).

works to push for future growth without erasing memory, and without disregarding the nuance and impact of this growth. The considerations that I have outlined here provide entry points for doing this work, and I believe that in continuing to outline and explore entry points of this sort, we can imagine structural change, and a planning practice that is truly founded in lived experience.

Reflection

In the final pages of *Ordinary Affects,* Kathleen Stewart discusses what the book is about, or perhaps what it is not about. She says,

> "It doesn't mean to come to a finish. It wants to speak out into too many possible scene with too many real links between them. It leaves me — my experiment — with a sense of force and texture and the sure knowledge that every scene I can spy has tendrils stretching into things I can barely, or not quite, imagine. But I already knew that. The world is still tentative, charged, overwhelming and alive. This is not a good thing or a bad thing. It is not my view that things are going well but they *are* going. I've tried to let go of pat answers I never exactly a believed anyway in an effort to stay in the middle of things" (128).

As much as this process has been about deconstructing the planning process, and about the real impacts planning practice has on individual and communal identity, this project has been an exploration for myself. I came into this process looking for a pat answer, looking for an element that projects that I believe had that founded them in the affective dimension, that I could apply to planning. I was looking for a way to build a planning practice that I believed in, and that I wanted to be a part of.

I realized pretty quickly that I could not do this. I could not do this because this is an undergraduate thesis, and because I only had eight months — and in actuality, more like six months. But I also now have realized that I maybe could not do this because there isn't a direct answer to this question, a direct course of action, a direct outlining of the right thing to do, the "good way" to plan. Kathleen Stewart taught me this. In the pages of *Ordinary Affects,* I have found solace, I have found a method of engaging with the world that makes sense to me, that seems to fit. In *Ordinary Affects* I found a way of

applying the concepts that I had learned in one part of my education to another part of my education. In doing this, though, in *Ordinary Affects,* and in the words of Kathleen Stewart, I found a sense of humility, a recognition that we can only be aware of so much, and that each intervention, each engagement with the world through writing, especially in academic spaces, is limited.

I have struggled through much of this research process to find a way to fit my ideas together, to take something that was ephemeral and find a way to make sense of it and to communicate it in a way that made sense to others. I still am unsure if I did this, but in this process, also, I have come to value ambiguity, engagements that are murky and uncertain, because fundamentally I think this is the way the world operates. I agree with Kathleen Stewart, I do not think that things are going well ever, they are just going, life ebbs and flows, and processes are always in flux. In many ways this view is reassuring. There are elements of the planning process that I find concerning, and I believe that fundamentally there needs to be structural change in the way that planners operate. But instead of viewing the planning process as a finite concept that needs to be deconstructed, I have come to view it as something that ebbs and flows, and that, in someways, operates on affect just by way of the individuals who make up planning processes. I do think that planning needs to change, but I feel that this change can happen, over time, and will happen incrementally.

This understanding of the world has helped me to embrace uncertainty in my own life. I feel completely in flux, and have for much of my education. What feels different though, is that I am starting to embrace this flux, to be okay with it, and to stop resisting it. I come out of this project excited about uncertainty, and excited about exploration, something that I have always rejected.

In many ways, also, this project was an attempt to bring together my education within the Comparative History of Ideas program (CHID), and the Community, Environment, and Planning program (CEP). CHID has always, for me, felt more theoretically, a program that embraced the sense-less and embraced nuance. I have found this in CEP, but for me, CEP has felt more structured, and more tied to practice. For the past year of this dual education, I felt confused, unsure of how to bring these two

elements together. Through this project, I have found a way to bring these two worlds together, and am

coming out of my time at the University feeling a sense of grounding in my education.

Works Cited

"2012 Kids Speak," film, *Yesler Terrace Youth Media*, 2012.

Charles Mudede, "The Twilight of Yesler Terrace," *The Stranger,* February 6, 2017.

Dan Kroman, "A Fading Community," *Crosscut,* 2013.

Ebenezer Howard, Garden Cities of To-Morrow, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2015).

Gillian Rose, "Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivity's and other practices," Progress in Human Geography 21, no. 3 (1997): 305-320.

Jen Graves, " Seattle Artists Race to Document Cultures Gentrification Is Erasing." *The Stranger,* November 30, 2016.

Jonathan Flately, *Affective Mapping* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).

John Caldbick, "The Seattle Housing Authority, Part 1 and 2," *History Link,* 2017.

Kathleen Stewart. Ordinary Affects (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2007).

Kathleen Stewart, "Worlding Refrains" in The Affect Theory Reader 2010, ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth (London & Durham: Duke University Press, 2010): 339-353.

Kevin Lynch, "The Image of the City" (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960).

Leoni Sandercock, "Out of the Closet: The Importance of Stories and Storytelling in Planning Practice," Planning Theory & Practice 4, no. 1 (2003): 11-12.

Margarethe Kusenbach, "Street Phenomenology: The go-along as an ethnographic research tool," Ethnography 3, no. 4 (2003): 455-485.

Mark Purcell, "Excavating Lefebvre," GeoJournal 58, no. 2 (2002): 99-108.

Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth, *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2010).

Michel de Certau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, (Berkeley: University of California, 3rd edition, 2011).

"Our Voices (Volume 3)," film, Yesler Terrace Youth Media. 2016. Web.

Saman Maydani and Sarah Kuck, *Even the Walls,* Film, (2015, Seattle).

Sara Ahmed. "Affective Economies." Social Text 22, no. 2 (2004): 117-39.

Sara Ahmed, "Happy Objects" in The Affect Theory Reader 2010, ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth (London & Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 29-52.

Susan Fainstein, *The Just City* (Ithaca: Cornell Press, 2010).

William Whyte, "The Social Life of Urban Spaces" (New York City: Project for Public Spaces, 2001).

"Yesler Terrace Community Outreach Activities," *Seattle Housing Authority*, 2004.

"Yesler Terrace Citizen Review Committee Glossary of Urban Planning and Design Terms," *Seattle Housing Authority*, 2008.

"Yesler Terrace Definitions and Defining Principles," *Seattle Housing Authority*, 2007.

"Yesler Terrace Background Report," *Seattle Housing Authority,* 2008.

"Yesler Terrace Development Plan," *Seattle Housing Authority,* 2011.