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In Part 2, the demands of teaching involve identifying a curriculum, that is the subject matter and skills to be imparted, and also the pedagogical methods for doing this. Each of the first three essays in this section are written by an architect who is also a teacher, and the subjects and approaches they take give insights into their creative practice. They explore how the two-way communication between teacher and student evolves into a fertile negotiation around the subjective interpretations of drawings, objects, and processes of design. Using their course Structural Contingencies as a subject, Caroline Voet and Steven Schenck develop a deep historical context for their teaching, which proposes a rereading of the material and structural details of architecture in defining the atmosphere and character of the spaces they enclose. Acknowledging the importance of Christian Kieckens, this exploration of the relationship between sensuous experience and conceptual understanding uses his concept of “Buildingness” to link research to design practice. Rosamund Diamond looks at examples used in her own teaching when she identifies three different drawing types as tools for design and communication. These are the figure-ground drawing as embodied in the Nolli Plan, 1748; the figure-ground projection using an example by Rafael Moneo, 1984; and Eileen Gray’s developed surface drawings from the late 1920s. By constructing concepts that associate the intentions and tasks of their progenitors with their potential uses in pedagogic and design contexts, she proposes new meanings for and ways of understanding the drawings in relation to the objects they represent. Thomas Coward makes connections between consultation strategies used in his own architectural practice, which involve conversations around memory and everyday objects, and how these inform his teaching in relation to a reading of his lived experience of Charles Moore’s Unit 9, where he used observation and drawing to record how different subjective spatial and temporal realities can resonate in the objects they contain.
Chapters 10 and 11 start not from a written argument, but from a series of sketches and models as tools that anchored theoretical reflections within the design studio. “The Unfinished Sketch” was written following a series of conversations between Louis Mayes and Philip Christou, former co-director with Florian Beigel of the Architecture Research Unit (ARU). A hand-drawn sketch by Beigel of a Korean *Pojagi* formulates the lines of thought through which the cyclical relationship between design and theory unfolds towards a new design and towards the student work in the design studio. The paper explores how this form of drawing remains inherently a product of both the hand and the mind – an intuitive response of the designer that may encompass the key concepts, histories, and spatial qualities of the project. Sereh Mandias gives an insight into the tools of her and Tomas Dirrix’s studio at the Chair of Interiors Buildings Cities at TU Delft, unfolding an intimate encounter with a series of 1:5 large models. The models are used as an instrument to examine the architectural qualities of the existing Museum Boijmans van Beuningen in Rotterdam and subsequently as a basis for architectural interventions within the museum. Neither detail nor space, the tactile approach of the 1:5 scale fosters empathy with the museum ensemble.
CHAPTER 7

Lost and Found: Intuition and Precision into Architectural Design, Studio Structural Contingencies KU Leuven, 2016–2021

Caroline Voet, Steven Schenk

Architecture is the essential being of building. Other forms come into being, they are not created.

Ever since Leon Battista Alberti’s conceptualisation of architectural design in the fifteenth century, according to which a building is an identical copy of the architect’s design, the role of analytical drawings or preliminary design sketches and models to explore principles of a space, a building, or a city remained crucial. The designing architect who analyses, sketches, and makes models is not merely a creator of spaces that elicit aesthetic responses. The act of designing is equally a research trajectory where the architect tries to capture social relations, as such, enabling the building’s position within contemporary society and architectural culture. The constant fostering of one’s own intuition as well as the critical questioning of a defined precision within this research is at the heart of the KU Leuven research platform and Master Studios Structural Contingencies. Its members’ PhD subjects, such as Dom Hans van der Laan (Caroline Voet), Kunio Maekawa (Hera Van Sande), Henri Labrouste (Eireen Schreurs), Sigurd Lewerentz (Steven Schenk) or Paul Neefs and Alfons Hoppenbrouwers (Laura Lievevrouw), embark on unravelling the processes of designing architects. To position the approach of the Structural Contingencies programme within architectural research, more specifically the studios led by the authors Caroline Voet and Steven Schenk, this paper critically explores its roots and traditions on architectural imagination and creation, mediating between sensuous experience and conceptual understanding. Although intuition is cherished as an instinctive feeling that drives the designing hand as a primary tool, designing in the studio is not a merely artistic
Fig. 7.1  Design for a funerary chapel, digital collage of model photography, by Joke Oelbrandt, student in the Studio Territory of Imagination II. Ma2 Structural Contingencies 2019–2020. Starting from Scarpa’s architecture, the building engages in an ambivalent relationship between structure and space.

Fig. 7.2  Design for a funerary chapel, model of inner spaces, scale 1:20, by Matthís Adam, student in the Studio Territory of Imagination I. Ma2 Structural Contingencies 2018–2019. The shifting angle of the layered interior spaces is based on the changing perspective in the Abbey of Thoronet. This gradual shift cannot be seen when moving through the inside; it can only be perceived.
Fig. 7.3  Design for thermal baths, a model as section, scale 1:20, by Tigone Priem and Lore Delputte, students in the Studio Territory of Imagination I. Ma2 Structural Contingencies 2018–2019. Interlocking geometrical spaces, creating irregular interlocking thresholds, based on John Soane's Bank of England.

Fig. 7.4  Design for a museum for architecture, model scale 1:20, by Wietse De Cooman, student in the Studio Territory of Imagination I. Ma2 Structural Contingencies 2018–2019. Architectural elements are objectified to create a new language, inspired by Heinz Bienefeld.
activity, and the output we seek is not merely artistic. It is about architecture and it is about being precise, which does not mean holding onto one’s frame of knowledge that then provides straightforward design solutions to straightforward questions. Precision means the sharpening of one’s intuition through the knowledge gained by reading and looking, which creates an extensive internal library that feeds the imagination with hybrid analogies.

Addressing the influence of our mentor Christian Kieckens, we start with his abstract plan analysis of Borromini in relation to Scarpa. It is ahistorical, but it belongs to a tradition, one that now continues in our work and especially in our teaching. The input of Otto Friedrich Bollnow, Paul Frankl, and James Ackerman, as well as dialogues with Eireen Schreurs, Wilfried Wang, and Sophia Psarra throughout the process of editing this book, have stimulated new lines of thought and insights. Architecture is a secret language that we seek to demystify and unravel.

Reading Architecture I. The Autonomous, Abstract Composition

The focus of the Structural Contingencies programme is on architectural language and involves the rereading of material and structural details in their relation to the experience of the spaces they enclose. Students work from the structural detail and the interior to the urban fabric, by (re)drawing and (re)modelling. To formulate design strategies, whether for new buildings or for reuse, a careful reading is made of existing pioneering, vernacular, or primitive architectures. These primary and ontological structures and spaces aim to fuel new attitudes and projects through mimesis and superposition. The aim is to reveal connections between design strategies and tools abstracted from their historical time frame and culture, and the architectural structures, spaces, and atmospheres that emerge from them. This ahistorical lens, which operates through architectural design and its creative methodologies, is then applied in the design studios, challenging students to develop a conscious design intention. How does intuition work, and where does precision come in?

The studio is deeply rooted within the tradition of the Belgian architect Christian Kieckens’s approach of Buildingness, which he developed as a design attitude, linking research to architectural practice. Architecture as a practical process is granted a certain autonomy from cultural considerations, and in this sense, it is understood as an ontological structure and a space to live in. From that perspective, it is granted its responsibility: the creation of an architectural identity as a cultural object. Identity has nothing to do with style or form but with the circumstances of “place” and “attitude,” nor is it an “alien” expression but rather the recovering of an authentic material language. To operate beyond personalised contradictory formal(istic) themes – self-referential as well as unique or formalistic – the studio fosters an awareness of design traditions
throughout history. From this, critical insights in linguistic expressions are generated: new programme typologies, materials, techniques, and the workings of space. This expertise provides a building with its form through a dialogue with existing conditions and ideas, from an accurate engagement with facts and things and from the specificities of a place and society at large. The language of architecture disposes of an inherent logic and structure linked strongly to an awareness of it within building. “Every intelligent handling of data, every further reform from a rediscovery, results in the essence of the concept of ‘traditio’: a further development based on existing achievements. Building on that tradition is what architects should do,” was fundamental for Kieckens: “Building is dealing with accuracies, of material, of proportion, of the relationship with the earth, of technology, of a span. Architecture is the result of an intelligent handling of that accuracy.”

Kieckens’s observations on architectural space, from that of Borromini to Scarpa, are based on an analysis through the abstract image of plan, section, and facade. This type of architectural analysis has its roots in the idealist criticism and gestalt psychology of German late nineteenth-century philosophy. The historical line of spatial concepts that developed from there starts with art and architecture critic Heinrich Wölfflin’s *Renaissance und Barock* (1888) and continues through to his pupils Paul Frankl’s *Principles of Architectural History* (1914), Rudolf Wittkower’s *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (1949), Sigfried Giedion’s *Space, Time and Architecture* (1941), and then to Wittkower’s pupil Colin Rowe, who in his turn influenced theorists like Richard Eisenman through publications including “The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa” (1947) and “Transparency, Literal and Phenomenal” (1963). Each in their own

---

**Fig. 7.5** Left: Christian Kieckens, superimposition of a symmetrical aerial photograph and a precise line drawing of a geometric analysis of Francesco Borromini's San Carlo alle Quattro Fontane, 1983. Right: Christian Kieckens, first proposal for the house in Baardegem (1990). Pages from: Christian Kieckens, “Form is One Function too” (1993): 8, 14–15.
Fig. 7.6  Tre et Uno Assieme (plan, section, and façade as one) by Christian Kieckens and geometric pattern of the San Carlo alle Quattro Fontane by Francesco Borromini. Starting from a 26:30 proportion, two triangles are drawn. From the centre of their perpendiculars, two inscribed circles are defined. From the same anchor points, two overlapping circles are drawn, which define the inscribed geometry of the whole Borrominian systematic. Sketch with black pen on A4 paper, made for an interview with MA students from KU Leuven, Faculty of Architecture Studio Fragile, 19 December 2014, tutors: Caroline Voet and Carl Bourgeois. See: “The Thinking Hand,” in Caroline Voet, Sofie De Caigny, Lara Schrijver, and Katrien Vandermarliere, eds., Autonomous Architecture in Flanders. The Early Works of Marie-José Van Hee, Christian Kieckens, Marc Dubois, Paul Robbrecht and Hilde Daem (Antwerp: Flanders Architecture Institute, 2016): 44–47. Sketch: Caroline Voet, private archive.
right revolutionised our understanding of geometry, modular pattern, and the ways in which plans are used to explain the work of an architect. Disinvested from the complexities of history, they invested in an abstract and intellectual approach towards the work of a given architect who could offer a coherent investigation surrounding perspective, proportion, geometry, and the advent of ideal form in architecture.

Within the vocabulary of the designing architect, applying this technique of reading an existing building gradually becomes incorporated, superimposed, or translated within their own design ideas. Where the schemes are directed towards a certain precision in composition, measurements, and proportion, their essential nature comes into being through the intuitive understanding of how the space works and functions. Reading a building or a drawing takes time. The slow process of going beyond looking towards actually understanding as an architect spans successive sessions of measuring, sketching, digital drawing, photographing, or model making. In the same way, when trained, a swift sketch by hand has the power to grasp the essence of a building with only a few defining lines. Only when this process is superimposed with attempts to name what one sees in order to find the right terminology that describes what it is, how it functions, and why, this type of close reading bridges artistic and scientific research.

In this sense, the process of reading a building is not so different from the process of creating one. Buildings are mosaics of accidents, adaptations, adjustments, additions, subtractions, revisions, and other errors. But where drawings of abstract, autonomous building principles are often directed towards an idealised version, the design process is a messy one. One of the oldest demonstrations is Palladio’s *The Four Books on Architecture*, in which the adjustments he made to some of his built projects so as to meet site contingencies are corrected in the new drawings to match an idealised version of design. In the same manner, the archetypal models of walls, rooms, and buildings in Dom Hans van der Laan’s book *Architectonic Space* exemplify philosophical spatial concepts. His design sketches and building plans obsessively follow exact hierarchies with units and proportions that culminate in measurements specified in centimetres. Even when drawing a building of 175 metres long, each single centimetre mattered. Nevertheless, Van der Laan’s models do not demystify the way his buildings draw you inside when you experience them. Clarity and a visible hierarchy between the whole and the parts seem to disappear within a never-ending layered composition made through an austere materiality, elementary colours, or precise daylight infiltration. Besides composition, they equally formulate the syntax, the language of architectural form. Questions arise around its treatment of mass and surface, and of light, colour, and other optical effects in relation to spatial concepts that capture experience and have meaning and engagement with society at large.
Dom Hans van der Laan, Wooden models, 1982, made for the travelling exhibition starting at Bonnefanten Museum Maastricht. © Van der Laan Archives. Van der Laan sought for the space that we involve in our existence through movement. The scale and hierarchy of architectonic space is constructed as such that it is in a superposition with the intuitive thresholds of one’s experience. Three experience fields surround one’s body: the workspace (the length of one’s body projected outwards, the scale of one room), the walking space, and the visual field. Van der Laan translated these directly into architecture: cella, court, domain. These become architectonic when one arises through the other.

Reading Architecture II. Sensing Hidden Anatomy

All the senses are engaged intensively when moving through Dom Hans van der Laan’s Roosenberg Abbey. In a similar way, Sigurd Lewerentz’s St. Peter’s Church draws its inhabitant into its presence through techniques of deformation and inclination inflicted upon the walls and the floor of the church. The result is the experience of a simple, archaic space despite, or unerringly through, the specificity of these well-chosen elements, carefully drawn by hand in series of detailed drawings. These ingredients constitute this space as an autonomous and whole entity with an appearance that is absent of expression, appearing as a condensed and essential simple cube-like space. Lewerentz seems to have found the precision in these elements’ expression and intensity to allow the human mind to conceive of their effects in a way that they are active, but at the same time remain silent. They do not become overtly present within the observer’s consciousness, unless actively sought. Lewerentz worked with details that are conceived and made with great precision, and do not contribute to a more excessive or ornamented and distracting whole. How can we understand this sublime experience of architecture that made Lewerentz into the mystic architect he is known for?

Answers to this question can be sought in the lived experience of the space and how materials and light appear at different times of the day. The character of darkness and the attitude of light in the interior space of the church generate a framework for the reduction of detail. Here, the light is not a Louis Kahn–like substance that lets the space come into being through its material quality, but it is flattening the hierarchy between source and surface so that they become equal players. Because of this performance in simultaneity, the idea of the building as a whole can relate to a much larger area of our perception. If all elements appear similarly important, our kinaesthetic selves immediately take over from our eyes and read the floor more strongly. The visual is no longer the primary sense through which the building is experienced, and the other senses are stimulated by the building in a special way.

To give an example, in the drawings of Swiss architects Raphael Zuber and Helena Brobäck a sophisticated detail can be seen, in which the bricks of the top lights are laid askew so that no light enters the church directly. This creates a contrast to the windows on the walls, which create a backlight so that the contours of the walls dissolve, and the ceiling and space as such, as a spiritual place, become more important. This effect is emphasised by the almost centred steel column that reinforces the central movement and builds a contrast to the more directional character of the ceiling.

All these details are something else when they are seen without context and become something different when they are all experienced simultaneously. Moreover, they interact with each other through their contradictions and tensions so that, for example, the position of the observer, but also sensual stimuli...
like music or change of light due to time and weather, can make a whole different building. The fact that Lewerentz was frequently present at the construction sites is due to his endeavour to tacitly understand subtle elements as being built parts, as well as their mutual relationship to the whole. This interest in the training of the senses is evident in Lewerentz’s earlier experimental photographs taken during his trip to Italy seventy-five years earlier.

Fig. 7.9 Sigurd Lewerentz, Sankt Petri Kyrka, Klippan Sweden, 1968. This building is a manifesto in the way it is made: the connection between walls, floors, and ceilings are micro-topographical worlds of excessive craftsmanship. The ceiling reveals a sympathy towards local vernacular farm buildings. The church becomes a space with linear and directional character, because the inclination is given a sense of organisation. © Steven Schenk.
Fig. 7.10  Slightly shifted from the middle of the space stands the steel column, which, depending on the location of the observer, has the potential to influence the directional character of the ceiling and give the space a more central movement. © Steven Schenk.

Fig. 7.11  Masonry detail, St. Mark’s Church, Bjorkhagen Sweden, 1960. Experimenting with deformation from a straight to a vaulted expression. © Steven Schenk.
But let us focus on the potential of contradiction that these details or ingredients have. If we are affected by the slightest change in their appearance, it is the active character of our interpretation that can radically reorient each understanding of the whole. This active collaboration between observer and building affects the intimate coexistence of our senses in such a way that the result can communicate instantly different realities from the same source. If architecture is the separation between interior and exterior, there is no thinner line able to contribute to something more versatile. It becomes a mechanism that creates multiple perceptions from only one stimulus, as the famous duck-rabbit drawing that amazed Ludwig Wittgenstein so enormously. The light in the building – made by the building – becomes a part of the architecture itself, as it is removed from the conditions of time. It seems that, in this place of enchantment, the territory of our reality dwells.

Within our own architectural practice and our teaching, we seek these occurrences that reveal the discrepancies between our senses that cannot be grasped directly in analytical plan drawings. We wonder how these ingredients can be found, and why they seem ineffable within our present-day methodical tools in architecture. Our design studio starts from this notion of sense as a way to read and understand existing phenomena and classify their potential by judging their relationship with our imagination. We try to study them through modelling, photography, drawing (by hand), and collage. We go on a quest to understand why, how, and when these things appear in order to collect and compare these ungraspable encounters. How can we reveal their hidden anatomy, and how to revive them actively in producing architecture?

This element of architectural learning and education plays a crucial part in the creation of an architecture rooted in the dialogue between our imagination and the real. To formulate new architectural strategies, the studio challenges a dialogue with tradition by framing mysteriousness with directness (and intuition with precision). It is directly asking the students to reveal the potential relevance of a given phenomenon in reality for our imagination. When designing, architecture is about discovering, recovering, uncovering, and about recognising the potential in images and drawings without a dislocation from its potential in built reality. This “return to the object” of the past addresses its logos, gravity, stratification, and tectonics through experience first, and from that precision, it addresses functional or cultural considerations. It aims at engendering a deep reading of the complexities of expression. Students search for buildings that embody these other ingredients, aiming to describe the immediate causes for the deliverance of architectural spaces that foster this reality. As such, they frame and redraw the etymological base and linguistic approach and Stimmung, meaning mood and atmosphere at the same time, rooted in a place. Seen from its own context of techniques, construction, and materials, the contextual phenomenon is reconstructed in its idea and relocated in a more universal pattern of thought.
Fig. 7.12  Folded beam of a roof structure, model in concrete. Cultural Centre Lokeren, competition design, not executed, Architect Juliaan Lampens, approx. 1960. “Auto-stability” (as defined by structural engineer Guy Mouton in a studio critique, February 2020): the structure is not added; it is embodied in the form itself. Human shelter at its most basic form. When the architectural detail is not decided yet, deciding upon that exact ontological moment amid a myriad of structural contingencies. Course leaders: Caroline Voet, Eireen Schreurs. Students: Wouter Persyn, Marie Van Parys, Guillaume Bernard. From a workshop in concrete modelling with Tomas Dirix as part of Meesterproef Structural Contingencies 2019–2020.

Fig. 7.13  Eglise Saint-Jacques te Conzac in Saintogne, concrete model grasping the building’s ontological Roman structure, by Maxim Lefebre and Reinout Vervaet, students in the Studio Territory of Imagination II. Ma2 Structural Contingencies 2019–2020.
To re-expose possible frameworks of productive thinking, we place our research within the frame of the primitive beginnings of human reasoning, where theories were derived from the sensory form of what was perceived or imagined. Equally sought out are examples that still hold this quality. Case study examples are the tomb of Hor-Aha in ancient Egypt (thirty-first century BC), the Stoa of Attalos in Greece (second century BC), but equally the Cistercian Abbey of Le Thoronet in France (twelfth and thirteenth centuries) or John Soane’s Bank of England (1971–1833). Those early explorations of nature are central in the studio, as they can reveal the relevance of some conceptual processes of discovery and invention that are still relevant in architectural production. The ability to focus on the senses requires an explicit training in recognising and understanding. It is by explicitly looking for these ineffable and sometimes forgotten elements that our design assignment focuses on the relationships between our senses. The studio and its educational approach intend to analyse the specific strengths and weaknesses of the ways in which sensory modalities interact and identify what entails the constituent of an intimate cooperation between proportions, materiality, and light as modulating this interaction.

**Making Architecture**

From the two frameworks of mapping described above, absorbing and using the ineffable and elusive qualities through the two-dimensional drawing and the three-dimensional model, photograph, collage, or sketch, we try to build up an act of recognition without dislocation by the use of our methodical apparatus. If the “analytical approach” and the “sense-awareness approach” focus on our general urge to understand ourselves and our surroundings, it is this double build-up framework that allows a focus on the potential of our perceptive self as a methodological body.

From the relationship between our innate ability to recognise and to imagine, we try to envision new potential. The studio builds up an inner world generated largely from these conscious experiences in the studio and of the individual’s personal repertoire, which is not limited to their reproduction. By talking about these ingredients, and by understanding drawings as figures that actively share these ingredients so that we can judge their potential, we try to activate the imagination. This way of producing architecture avoids any dislocation from space and its possible impact or reduction of our thought processes. Sharing our work in the studio, we try to grasp the mechanisms of the creative process, aiming to reveal how widely human beings explore and comprehend by acting and handling rather than by mere contemplation.

From this perspective, we and our students make models and drawings by hand that range from precise geometries obtained with a scaled ruler to intuitive patterns of space. The sketches and models seem to be of autonomous
Fig. 7.14  Drawing possibilities of presence and absence of spatial elements. Pencil drawing by Schenk Hattori, 2017. © Schenk Hattori.

Fig. 7.15  Sequential sections mapping the topography of the building and its surroundings, Chorley Elementary School by Paul Rudolph (1969, demolished 2012), by Kristof Bonny and Lise Brusselmans, students in the Pioneering Morphologies, MA1 Structural Contingencies 2018–2019.
structures as no context is drawn. Nevertheless, they grew out of embedded tacit knowledge and aim to be expressions of a sensitivity to that precise context. The patterns executed by the drawing hand are lines of association and memory, grown from the empathic immersion of the author within the project, their personal perspective and cultural background. The potentials of a possible built space are creatively explored. The lines of inquiry are synthetic, expressing humanistic perspectives of use, life conditions, human relations and experiential aspects, the context and spatial character of the envisaged building.

The seemingly opposing skills of precision and intuition are brought into play with each other, fostered and trained through creative practice, study, and experiment. Whether making abstract analytical schemes or rough design sketches, they both embody what was and what could be without trying to represent something other than themselves. In this, precision is not only present within the exact analytical scheme, and intuition is not only part of the creative sketch by hand. When the analytical mechanism is as creative as the design sketch, through the fostering of an emphatic relation with the object of research, this lens can offer lost keys for understanding the building. Equally, the sketch can embody a layered content of precise observations beyond mere representation.

Fig. 7.16 Possible pattern of rooms at Roosenberg Abbey by Dom Hans van der Laan. Pen drawing on loose A4, Caroline Voet, 2021. © Caroline Voet.
Notes


3. The research platform and Master studios Structural Contingencies is part of the Faculty of Architecture at KU Leuven and is based at Campus St.-Lucas in Ghent. Coordinated by Caroline Voet, it got its start in 2018. Its members carry the hybrid profile of practising architect, educator, and researcher. Most of them have obtained a PhD or are in the course of conducting one. Members are Caroline Voet, Hera Van Sande, Klaas Goris, Eireen Schreurs, Steven Schenk, and Laura Lievevrouw. See also: www.structuralcontingencies.be.

4. The notion of “Buildingness,” according to Christian Kieckens, originates in a conversation with the American artist Dan Walsh. Kieckens elaborated it further in 1999 as a plea for the coexistence of building, structure, image, and space as one inseparable whole. It evolved as the theoretical and conceptual framework for a studio brief implemented at the Technical University of Eindhoven (1999–2002) and the Architectural Association in London (2000–2002), which was taught with Caroline Voet. Both authors of this article have worked within Kieckens’s office, learning the craft of close observation and precise design skills. Steven Schenk graduated in his studio at the University of Antwerp in 2009. Christian Kieckens, “Buildingness,” *Zoeken, Denken, Bouwen* (Ghent: Ludion, 2001), 116.


7. Psarra Sophia, Chapter 5, 81–94.


10. For an insight into Dom Hans van der Laan’s design practice, see www.domhansvanderlaan.nl. Also see, for example, Caroline Voet, *Dom Hans Van Der Laan: A House for the Mind - A Design Manual on Roosenberg Abbey* (Antwerp: Flanders Architecture Institute, 2017).
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