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# Introduction

This chapter explores the ways in which the sensorial understandings of the city generated by dance practitioners can provide the basis for dialogue with urban design and planning as a discipline. The ‘Moving and Mapping’ micro-project within the larger Sensing the City project focussed on embodied approaches to coming to know site, place and community. [Insert N2] Implicit within this is the assumption that inhabitants and environments are inextricably linked; and that moving in and through the city is a way to make this inter-relationship known and thus accessible to city planners. Research questions that the Moving and Mapping micro-project set out to explore include:

* What can the embodied knowledges harvested by dance artists within Coventry city sites reveal about place, movement in space and publics in the city?
* How might an embodied relationship to space and place catalyze or support urban planning in a city?
* How might dance artists contribute to public interest design (PID) methodolgies within urban design and planning (Kim 2018, 337)?

The activities of the Moving and Mapping micro-project revolved largely around the work of the artist collective *enter & inhabit*, who have developed a site-responsive dance practice within the city of Coventry for over ten years. *enter & inhabit* attends to sites over a long duration, through an iterative movement practice, mapping both what changes and what remains the same within the city landscape. Seasonal shifts, processes of destruction and construction in the urban landscape and shifting populations (according to university term times, for example) influence how the city can be felt and experienced. In this sense, *enter & inhabit* offers what dance artist and scholar Carol Brown has describes as ‘an alternative mapping beyond the reduction of “site” to a quantitatively surveyed plot with fixed dimensions’ (Brown 2015, 207). The dance practice is considered to be a living part of the site contributing to its moment-to-moment emergence. The practice might also be configured as a form of corporeal cartography – or what artist-scholars Britto and Jacque describe as ‘urban corpographia’ – which generates a ‘record of the experience of the city [as it is] inscribed on the bodies of those who experience it’ (Britto and Jacque 2014, 47). Building upon *enter & inhabit’s* established approach, over a 10-year period to moving in the city – which is intimately situated within Coventry’s complex history and future status as UK City of Culture (2021) – this chapter presents perspectives on the lived experience of the city. This is not only about reflecting on personal perspectives; we are also tracking the concepts and methods of artistic practice that developed as part of the research enquiry as a way of valuing sensory experience. We suggest that the insights generated through this approach to dance research, whether based around how the city is inhabited or ways of investigating this, can contribute to the development of city landscapes more broadly and to the regeneration of the city of Coventry specifically.

# Moving and Mapping micro-project: an overview

The Moving and Mapping micro-project incorporated a series of labs (practice as research) and salons (discussions with key practitioners in the fields of site dance, architecture and urban design and planning), as well as semi-structured interviews with selected arts and urban planning representatives. The *enter & inhabit* practice, which was at the core of the work, consisted of a series of week-long intensive labs (slide show if images available on the e-Resource.) [Insert N3] The labs with the *enter & inhabit* collective engaged in dance practice as research (PaR) through return to sites and movement scores, as a process of investigation, reflection, and analysis. Bolt notes on PaR that (2016, 136) ‘the research process inaugurates movement and transformation through iterability…“the new” emerges through iterative practice.’ Fleishman (2012, 34) also understands repetition to be part of creative evolution in PaR, suggesting that:

It is not progressivist, building towards a finality; nor is it mechanistic in the sense that it knows what it is searching for before it begins searching. It begins with energy (an impulse, an idea, an intuition, a hunch) that is then channelled, durationally, through repetition, in variable and indeterminable directions.

With the emphasis on repeatedly returning to sites in *enter & inhabit*’s practice, the materials and understandings emerge over time. It is not pre-determined towards a latent goal or leading in steps towards it, rather it moves in unruly and innovative ways. The hunch, or ‘expert intuition’ (Melrose 2003), is that the practice will lead to new concepts and forms through repetition, reflective practice and sharing process. Rather than solely gathering data, there is also an implicit understanding that the practice already acts in the world, changing it through the encounter. The artist’s perception is also changed as creative forms and new ideas grow. Later in this chapter, we describe how this return over time to sites foregrounds emergence of new ideas and practices that can also contribute to urban design and planning.

In addition to the *enter & inhabit* labs, we invited four artists from dance, visual arts, and theatre to work with *enter & inhabit* over two additional two-day labs. These artists, including Helen Poynor, Hilary Kneale, Paula Kramer and Sandra Reeve, have worked in Coventry city through embodied and site-based practices within the last ten years. Interviews also took place with founder members of *Decoda,* Lily Hayward Smith and Katye Coe, who ran this now closed organisation that brought cutting edge dance practice to Coventry city from 2007-2017. This combination of labs and interviews provided a means of reflecting on site dance in Coventry, exploring what the moving body can offer to the city, but also considered differences of practice between artists. Three salons brought together the concerns of the labs in conversation with other key researchers, artists and organisations undertaking work in cities and outdoor sites. The salons during 2018 and 2109 explored topics such as what happens when women are visible or behaving playfully in the city (Abulhawa); how collaborative arts practice and city planning can develop neighbourhoods (Spanton); the interaction between dance and architecture students (Sara and Sara); dance in transportation design or exploring the city as a pedestrian (Wookey), curating city artworks with local communities (Davies and Griffith), and long-term dance-architecture collaborative projects (Frith and Salem). A city walk was also devised, oriented around mini-interventions by dance artist/architect pairings Salem and Frith, Sara and Sara, as well as *enter & inhabit* artists. The aim was to test out how to distil practical activities to share with city planners on how to ‘sense the city’, with participants including Aude Biquelet-Lock, Deputy Head of Policy and Research and Jo Shore, Head of Public Realm at Coventry City Council. [Insert N4.] While this chapter will focus primarily on the *enter & inhabit* practice, in keeping with the collaborative and cumulative methodology ofthe collective*,* the overall micro-project was deeply enriched and informed by the labs with other artists and the salon discussions. Key themes that appeared across the salons include the sensory/experiential city, (ethical) transgression/interrupting norms, boundaries and flow, pedestrian/cars, community led planning, and who is visible in the city. These of course appear throughout our examination of *enter&inhabit’s* work in this chapter, as the discussions and practices then fed into the process and modes of sharing the research.

Aspects of the *enter & inhabit* practice in the city were selected to be circulated more publically primarily through the Sensing the City exhibition held at the Herbert Art Gallery in January 2020. A one-off, hand-made *artists’ book* was created for the exhibition with scores, selected images, and explanatory text about the *enter & inhabit* practice from two periods of work: 2007-2009 and 2018-2020. An updated and adapted digital version has been created which is available on the eResource. The book reveals periods of practice at different points of Coventry city’s development, which is reflected in the images and scores that run throughout the book. A *postcard series* was also developed from images and scores selected by the invited lab artists and *enter & inhabit,* available in the e-Resource. For example, one card has an image of objects and people leaning over, with a score on the back that invites people to try ‘leaning and landing’ in the city, developed by Paula Kramer. Although the initial idea was that the postcards could be used by people to go out into the city to try out the scores, they also served other purposes such as initiating conversations at the exhibition, on topics such as the safety of the city, memories of sites, and how the scores might work in rural environments. A series of *large printed images* were also mounted at the exhibition which contrast distant shots of people and close up detail of the sites. Alongside, a *table with stacks of small images* prompted people to make a story by placing the images in a relationship to each other. Here, people took time to touch, place and comment on the scenes, often organising them into narratives based on their own interests and experience of the city.

Finally, the daily movement practice by *enter & inhabit* occurred for the duration of the exhibition, where the collective went out into the city with a small audience following from place to place. This involved performative exploration of different parts of the city at set times of day during the exhibition. It undertook a route around the underpass system at Junction 5 of the inner city ring-road, in front of the police station, by an old tree, and past a series of shops, a café and row of estate agents. The practice took place at different times each day: early morning, midday and evening; this ensured changes to lighting, traffic and numbers of passers-by, while the weather of course changed each day, ranging from storm to sunshine. Each location had a different score associated with a body system, for example the skeletal or endocrine system. The score began at Junction 5 crossing a bridge over the ringroad, with a focus on bones – noticing the felt body structure in relation to the the bridge: ‘attending to the architecture and structure of the skeleton / meeting the environment with support of bone layers – compact bone, spongy bone, bone marrow’ (see exhibition book in eResource). The tree area was scored to explore the ‘chemical responsivity and receptivity of endocrine’, with the emphasis on being alert to the range of ‘interactional negotiations/fleeting connections’ experienced with passing traffic and commuters (see exhibition book in eResource). This linking of urban space qualities to the body systems might appear metaphorical, but the relationship between the two was developed through site work which investigated which body systems resonated or directly supported working in a particular site. However, there was a more open underlying score (‘underscore’) which permeated the entire practice, that reminded the dancers to let go of score directions when needed. This underscore focuses on ‘acknowledging and integrating the conditions of the moment’, asking ‘what’s needed in the space?’ and emphasises ‘following your inclination, receiving receiving, allowing movement to emerge’ (see exhibition book in the e-Resource). [Insert N5] This meant that main site scores could be dropped, altered and improvised in relation to what was currently happening in the environment and for the dancers. For example, while the connection of the underpass score to the arterial flow in blood circulation often stimulated ‘lively’, flowing and active movement, sometimes the conditions prompted a different kind of response. The tiredness of the week-long activities occasionally affected the dancers’ capacity for movement; rainy and stormy weather initiated different activity from sunshine; unpredictable pathways and behaviour of audience triggered conversations, movement or stillness. This section has aimed to introduce the activities and materials generated during the micro-project, while the next section addresses in more detail the background for the *enter & inhabit* collective’s approach, especially in relation to the notion of sensing, before situating it within the field of site dance more broadly.

***enter & inhabit*: approaches to sensing and perceiving the city**

As a practice, *enter & inhabit* investigates the changing experiences of outdoor spaces that people pass through.[Insert N6] Using durational movement improvisation, photography and writing, the practice explores embodied presence in *sites of flow and transition*. This activity recognizes and foregrounds interaction between people and places, exploring how the embodied population of sites can invoke new encounters with familiar places. The work is underpinned by a set of somatic movement practices, with the term ‘somatic’ being coined by Thomas Hanna (1928-1990) in the 1970s to speak about ‘the body as perceived from within by first-person perception’ (1995: 341). ‘Somatic practices’ is now employed as an umbrella term encompassing a wide range of movement practices that focus on highly sensitised approaches to bodily movement. *enter & inhabit* works with a series of somatic practices through site dance practice, casting accidental audience and invited witnesses as co-creators, sharing traces of the artists' embodied experience as an invitation into public spaces and landscapes. Central concerns include the emphasis on a cyclical process of action and reflection; and the attention to sensing, feeling, action and perception. A relationship with the surrounding context, whether local environment, social or cultural situations, is understood through the practices of Body Mind Centering (BMC)®, Authentic Movement (AM) and the work of Anna and Lawrence Halprin, specifically the RSVP cycles outlined below.

In 2007, Garrett Brown and Voris began to use their ongoing training in somatic movement practices to explore durational dance improvisation practice in outdoor spaces. The first site the project was concerned with was the underpass system of the Coventry ring road, which comprises of concrete structures with landscaped gardens, longstanding trees and historic monuments. This resulted in a duet that was performed in a series of underpasses around the ring road in 2008 as part of the Summer Dancing festival. Photographer Christian Kipp and dancer/writer Niki Pollard joined the project in 2009, to develop the work further, both in Coventry and also for residencies at Aberystwyth University and in Bovey, North Devon. Since then, *enter & inhabit* has worked in wooded sites, rivers, beaches, university campuses and farmers’ fields. Over the past few years, it returned to the Coventry ring road as part of the Sensing the City project, collaborating with movement artist and scholar Emma Meehan between 2017-2020.

Broad in its spread of references and lineages, *enter & inhabit* can be located within independent contemporary dance practice, coming out of the British New Dance tradition.[Insert N7.]Following the teachings of UK-based environmental dance-maker Helen Poynor, the collective draws on Anna and Lawrence Halprin’s model of collaborative working with the environment, *The RSVP Cycles*. Particular to this model is a cyclical approach to making, through and across four key stages termed as: Resourcing (R), Scoring (S), Valu-action (V) and Performance (P).[Insert N8] With this model in mind, as they work *enter & inhabit* seeks to celebrate collaborative responses to site, understanding the creative process of the artists involved and the sites engaged with, to be continually unfolding. A cyclical process of movement and photographic practice alongside writing, drawing and image- reflection embeds responses to the city over time into movement scores. These scores are not stable and are constantly re-written with the new information gathered from the changing sites. The exhibition book in the eResource shows how the scores have changed over time, maintain some elements and altering others. Such scores are not bound by the terms of a specific event or performance deadlines but, rather, feed into months and years of movement and photography in returning to a particular place. Integral to the work is the photographic practice of Christian Kipp, which becomes an important mode of sense-making within the cyclical process. In selecting and editing images created in companionship with the onsite movement practice, Kipp’s photographic work offers a reflection on what was sensed, felt and found and how this might inform the next stages of creative practice in the city. Images generated from inhabiting certain sites might become slide shows on the website which in turn fuel the resourcing cycle of movement and score-writing. Part of the reflective process is also the consideration of how elements of this approach to sensing the city might be shared with public audiences in ways that are appropriate to that site. In working in this fluid and processual manner, which seeks no definitive conclusions, the group embrace and celebrate the sites’ impermanence. [Insert N9.]

Another lineage of movement practice which informs *enter & inhabit’s* approach to site-work and to collaboration includes the understandings of sensation, perception and body systems in the somatic education practice Body- Mind Centering (BMC)®. Initially developed by Bonnie Bainbridge Cohen in the 1970s in North America, BMC® uses guided and improvisational movement, touch, and exploration of anatomical images alongside reflective practice. Integral to this experiential study, and the work of *enter & inhabit*, is the differentiation of the four distinct but interrelated ‘catagories’ of sensory receptors. Olsen outlines:

…the *interoceptors* (which monitor the processes of the internal organs such as blood chemistry, heartbeat and digestion), the *exteroceptors* (skin and connective tissue which are responsible for monitoring the outer environment through touch), the *proprioceptors* (found in the joints, ligaments and tendons, muscles, and the inner ear, are cumulatively responsible for registering movement, balance, and body position in space) and the *special senses* (sight, sound, smell, taste and touch) (2002: 57).

This perspective on the phenomenon of sensation indicates how the process of sensing is located in a range of tissues throughout the body and is innately intertwined with the environment. Direct engagement with such different sensory channels *–* and with *sensation* as a holistic and active phenomenon– highlights our innate sensitivity, porosity and ‘response-ability’ as human beings (Olsen 2002: 55). Sensing here is understood as an ongoing dialogue, one which responds to the changing environment and one that enables the artists to simultaneously attend to their bodies as inhabitants in the city. The different modes or categories of sensing (which are always intertwined and not separate) serve to illuminate the multilayered, holistic and relational nature of sensing itself and offer a poetic resource for the practical enquiry.

Working in the area around the newly rebuilt Coventry city railway station, for example, the group sat around on chairs which had recently been installed or walked in the vicinity to get a sense of the space. The area had been cleared to offer a long and open‘boulevard’ space, crossed by traffic arriving from the ring road and dropping passengers off. Reflection afterwards included noting the sense of scale and vastness, brightness of the reflective glass fronted buildings, noise and constant motion of groups passing through in contrast with the dwelling of *enter & inhabit*. This led to various feelings among the collective including a sense of overwhelm, exposed, visibility, vulnerability, and uneasiness. Return to the site explored attention to a the weight and fullness of organs, to offer a counterpoint to its architectural linearity and flatness, and to find a new way to respond to the visual and auditory over-stimulation. As this example indicates, it is difficult in practice to separate out interoception and exteroception, or sensing and perceiving that have been named here as a way to explain steps of the process but which are rather intertwined. Further, as the title of Bainbridge Cohen’s book *Sensing, Feeling and Action* suggests, action is not separate from the moment of sensing; and in tandem with this is the added layer of ‘feeling’ interpreted as an emotional quality in BMC. In this way, *enter &inhabit* incorporates sensory input gained from the body and from the environment; the feeling induced in the process of being in a space and moving in it; the action and response that is part of being a sensing and feeling body.

The contemplative practice of Authentic Movement (AM) is the final lineage which informs the *enter & inhabit* practice. AM was first developed in the 1950s and 60s by Mary Starks Whitehouse, a North American dancer with some training in Jungian analysis. Whitehouse sought to develop a format for movement practice that would enable the unconscious (or that which we do not yet know) to surface through open-ended movement exploration (1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 1999d). Periods of moving are followed by periods of reflection, during which mover and witness seek to articulate their experience (through language) to each other. Despite its name, AM is not concerned with ideas of ‘authenticity’ per se, but rather refers to an open and enquiring attitude toward experiencing and reflecting upon movement. The practice seeks to embrace different modalities of attention such as proprioception, sensation, emotion and imagination. Because of this explicit acknowledgement of emotion and imagination as perceptual channels within and alongside the sensorial, AM offers a means by which to make one’s perceptual processes conscious. As Olsen notes:

Billions of receptors throughout our structure constantly feed us signals about ourselves and our surroundings. Our ability to organize and interpret these signals is called perception […] Understanding this perceptual process can help us act from the sensory information available at the moment […] enhancing our ability to respond (2002: 55).

Although sensing forms an important scaffold for *enter & inhabit’s* practices as a means to gather information; it is also underpinned by perception of the environment. Through its protocols for communicating with fellow participants, AM offers a means by which to recognize and respect potential differences in perception. This sensitivity to perception within AM informs the approach to attuning to site and the many populations (human and non-human) that dwell there, in a process called ‘witnessing’. Witnessing occurs through the process of noticing ones own perceptions while moving or watching others move, and processing them through journaling and speaking. At times, the collective sat and witnessed the space and each other, and noticed how the site was witness to their activities. As Voris notes in her journal entires: ‘Sitting between/Three trees watching/Listening to traffic’ or ‘Stillness / dwelling / pausing / sensing flow / framing others’ activity/ A counterforce to the police / somatic surveillance’. This novel kind of ‘surveillance’ aimed to replace a sense of mistrustful observation with a sensory engagement with sites and reflection on perceptions of them.

Together, these practices of RSVP, BMC and AM support the understanding of site as a material entity – a materiality which is defined by its history, design, current social use and population which is in a state of continual transformation. With the aim of creating an attentive dialogue between the materiality of site and moving bodies, *enter & inhabit* gathers sensitised perspectives on city dwelling, characterized by an understanding of the inter-relationship between people and their surrounding environment. Environment here is understood broadly to encompass whatever is in the site. This might be the textures of the walls or plants, the sound of traffic or pedestrians or the rhythm of dogs and rats that regularly pass through. Histories, cultures, social mores, and political influences, of the environment are also sensed in and through the practice. A journal entry by Meehan notes how moving at the Cheylesmore Manor House in Coventry informed reflections on poverty and wealth in the city. This building serves as Coventry city register office which holds wedding ceremonies and was once a prosperous medieval royal palace; its doorstep housed a homeless couple on a cold Sunday morning (March 2019, available in e-Resource). The movement sessions on the site variously provoked imaginings of past inhabitations, encounters of comings and goings, as well as generating a sensitivity to those who have briefly made it their ‘home’. Sensing sites stimulates reflection on the histories as well as current social phenomena in a site, and informs pathways and tone of movement there also.

It is not only the sites which are embedded with historical and social experiences, but so too are the people flowing through these spaces. The biological rendering of sensory perception as ‘the five senses’ might seem to negate or neutralise the dominant role that enculturation plays in sensory perception (see Banes and Lepecki 2007). Cultural geographer Nigel Thrift notes how (2004, 599):

‘thinking about space can vary quite radically from culture to culture, down to and including the most basic frames of reference such as what counts as the characteristic shape of an object, sense of direction, the spatial relation of bodies … and the sense of where a body is in its relation to larger surroundings.’ The *enter & inhabit* practice reveals the interplay between inheritances that are ingrained and learned from personal backgrounds (such as artistic trainings or gendered behaviour) and the environment that is encountered. The various trainings of the artists in dance, theatre, and photography have strong US and European influences which affect how space is perceived, traversed and recorded. Aesthetic values from Western contemporary dance composition influence timing, spatial arrangement and other forms of modulation. A somatic approach to space is of course also informed by the cultural perceptions embedded in it, drawing from a range of Western and non-Western practices and philosophies. BMC founder Bonnie Bainbridge Cohen’s work was influenced by training in occupational therapy, various forms of contemporary dance, dance movement therapy, circus, yoga, T'ai chi ch'üan, and many more movement practices (Eddy 2006 and 2009). The socially and culturally constructed practices and identities shape the way the artists, as individuals and as a collective, sense and perceive the city (sometimes quite differently from each other).

Perceptions are in flux as a city and global political moment changes; in addition the somatic mode of attention tries to bring these perceptions to awareness, avoid fixing them and even change them. Somatic practices are often ascribed with the capacity ‘to open awareness’ so this can have the additional effect of also confronting the mover with experiences which are beyond their personal, cultural and social reference points. As Fernandes notes, somatic approaches are ‘[n]ot […] domesticating the body in search of an ideal form … but rather stimulating the development of relational and adaptive abilities grounded on sensorial experience, through creative interaction with the environment’ (Fernandes 2015, 19). In exploring ‘point, line and angle’ in a Coventry park with Sandra Reeve, Voris notes in her journal that ‘I find myself doing things I wouldn’t normally do…it takes me places I wouldn’t have gone’ (March 2019). The movement practice also brings about the possibility to take up city spaces in ways that goes against the grain, with Meehan noting: ‘ Lying upside down/ With legs on a tree / Conspicuous / Seeing passers-by / And bus passengers/ People watching, smiling /A man says “keep going” ’ (March 2019). Apart from inviting playfulness, the openness to site can show how people are allowed to move in space and interrupt these experiences. In this sense, a site dance practice informed by somatic practices may offer the potential to challenge personal perceptions, to respond to environments and, as part of that response, to re-imagine such how such public spaces might be inhabited.

The *enter & inhabit* collective’s attitude to 'sensing' is multi-layered, holistic, and relational. Sensing and perception are active rather than passive proceseses as people participate in how they take in and understand the environment. The ‘felt-sense’ (Gendlin 1978/2003) [Insert N11.] of a site is a resource for discerning the experiences of inhabiting urban spaces, to reflect on their design and planning. In the next section, we contextualise this work in the field of site dance to explore what these practices ‘do’ through ‘being’ in public sites, leading to a discussion of how this can feed into urban design and planning. In particular, we examine how the *enter & inhabit* collective engages in ‘situated’ dance as a means to explore behaviour in city sites.

# Situated dance in the city

As a site-responsive approach to dance, the *enter & inhabit* collective returns to the same sites over many years through these holistic, reflective and sensory practices, with elements of the process made available to an audience, whether through scores, images or improvised dance. This approach lies in contrast with the kind of site dance performances which dominate city arts festivals according to Kloetzel (2017) where a ‘site-adaptive’ choreography is made to be modifiable to many outdoor sites, so it can tour to a range of festivals and cities. Often within large festivals as free public events, such work tends to prioritise acrobatic and virtuosic movement, and expressive physicality that can be read by audiences at a distance (Kloetzel 2017, 113). This clearly has value for reaching large audiences and drawing attention to outdoor spaces in exciting ways. However, the features of the *enter & inhabit* collective’s work are quite different. The movement practice is not re-worked into a pre-rehearsed set of physical phrases as performance material to be shared, nor is it presented in a different outdoor space from which the work was developed. Working with the sites over a long time, the practice moves between different paces, qualities and registers depending on the response to the site, the nature of the score and the interaction with the accidental and/or invited audiences.

The audience forms by *happening* upon the work, as *enter & inhabit* goes about its regular site practice. The focus is on the daily life of a site and its inhabitants, and takes into consideration how it is experienced by occupants at different times of day and in different seasons. Kipp notes that ‘Standing in an underpass is weird. People just look and look away. Summer weather affects perception’ (May 2018). Meanwhile, Voris comments: ‘Noticing different energies in people / in the morning and in the evening. Duration of encounters with accidental audience tends to last between 5-20 seconds. A woman who regularly passes by said: “Aw…the dancers.” A man smoking by the tree asks: “Am I in your way?”’ In January 2020, Meehan notes ‘At the ringroad, van drivers film and give us thumbs up. By the tree, a woman wants to show me her Facebook page with 140 likes for her photos of Coventry.’ At some point, however, the practice locations are generally made more public and therefore a ‘knowing’ audience can arrive to observe the practice also. This moment of opening serves as a culmination point where wider audiences such as artists, cultural and city organisations, as well as interested members of the general public, can be invited to share the site with the artists during the practice. This ultimately alters the actual practice somewhat since audiences ‘in the know’ often stay for longer durations and watch in groups. The position and mode of engagement of audience members, whether accidental or invited, therefore becomes another element of the landscape to be responded to – however, the commitment remains to practice in relation *with* the site rather than to share rehearsed material *from* the site.

At the same time, the *enter & inhabit* practice has developed across a number of locations. The creative processes reside partially within the movement practices of the artists involved. The methods gained through working long term in sites are understood to become part of the knowledge held in the bodies of the artists. This ‘understood’ way of working with sites informs how to begin to engage with a new site, while at the same time significant durations of time are spent with detailed attention to it so as to come gradually to *sense* its environment. In some ways, the practice could be considered site-adaptive since it brings pre-established methods *to* a site, which is seen as continually living and evolving, and therefore always ‘new’. At the same time, the practice has a particular affinity with Coventry, as the place where it developed and occupied the most substantial amount of time. Coventry city is a prime instigator and nodal point for many site dance artists in part because of the location of Decoda and Coventry University’s Centre for Dance Research in the city, with associated events such as Summer Dancing or the Dance and Somatic Practices Conference. At the same time, the complexity of Coventry city as a series of ‘challenging’ sites can be attractive to site dance, due to the ring road, varied architectures, and continual changes in city development. As Rachel Sara indicated at a salon, there are‘benefits of unfinished space’ (November 2019). The work could be considered to have developed a Coventry-based form of site-responsive dance; however, it is also adaptive in that this approach can travel with the artists to new sites where it may, in turn, develop its own distinctive qualities. As later discussion will explore, this is important especially in its reach to understand urban design and planning and how responsive methods might begin to stimulate adaptive tools for other cities.

Hunter (2015) notes that the work of many site dance artists does not easily fit within the series of categories of site work (site specific, place responsive, site adaptive) available in theatre and performance studies. She points in particular to the difficulty of placing the work of what she describes as ‘environmental movement artists’ where ‘the body’s immersion in the landscape constitutes the central core of their dance practice and the movement outcomes may (or may not) be presented for sharing with others’ (18). Amongst these environmental artists, she names Helen Poynor and Sandra Reeve, invited lab artists in the micro-project, both of whom work with somatic practices, Amerta Movement developed by Indonesian dance artist Suprapto Suryodarmo and/or Anna Halprin’s Life/Art process. There is an resemblance between these artists’ work and that of *enter & inhabit* in how they approach sites. Reeve (2015, 311-312) describes a shifting away from ‘inscription’, where movement is placed on the surface of site, to ‘incorporation’ of audience/performers into the site through visceral encapsulation. In other words, the site is not a backdrop on which dance work is placed; instead the dance work and audience are immersed within and surrounded by the site. Introducing another term, Voris (2018, 50) comments that her practice is ‘situated’, as it ultimately grows ‘slowly and organically out of a holistic and situated attitude toward movement rather than out of the explicit intention to foreground the site in which it takes place.’ The site is therefore not just an external space to put as a focal point to the work, but rather it becomes embedded in the long-term experience of the mover, with Voris (2018, 50) adding that: ‘I prefer the term ‘situated’ (rather than ‘site-specific’) for the attention it calls to a holistic awareness of the entire context and of one’s personal history or standpoint in relation to that context.’ *enter & inhabit* engage a situated sensibility, through long term immersion in site, co-evolution between site and artist, and the importance of context in the work.

However, there are shared dimensions between site dance as a wider field and the situated work of *enter & inhabit*, especially in relation to the role of the audience. Kloetzel and Pavlik (2009) identify how some site artists question what counts as appropriate behaviour in public space, and propose ‘a model and a guide for future human-place exchanges’ (122-124). Similarly, *enter & inhabit* as a collective inhabits city spaces in ways that they are not usually used. This includes, for example, dwelling in underpasses, lying in unoccupied zones, touching the ground and walls, expressively taking up space as women, bringing attention to discarded rubbish and testing the boundaries of implicitly and explicitly disallowed routes. The situated dance practice of *enter & inhabit* might not appear overtly political in that it does not take a particular social or political issue as a theme to be examined and presented in the artwork. However, the subtle occupation of a public space and engaging in ‘unlicensed’ behaviour has wider political implications. The practice literally happens without license as it is not a ‘performance’ per se, sanctioned, typically, by a city council, but a daily practice that anyone might undertake, such as stretching or running in the park. However, the practice contradicts the sort of activities that are generally expected or understood; it can be seen to contest how a space is conventionally used or seen. [Insert N12.] As an early score in development states: ‘normalizing the abnormal /suspicious behavior /intervening with authority /ethical subversion’.

Schiller and Rubidge (2014) propose that such site dance can leave resonances and produce shifts of an audience’s relationship with space, both on the macro level of perceiving the site differently, but also on a micro-level through ‘the subtle inner remapping of the systems of the body constantly negotiating itself through space’ (16). *enter & inhabit* attends to the level of the body’s perceiving of site, alongside moving in dynamic ways in space. The practice engages with people (and, indeed, animals) who happen to pass by, as well as the materials of the space, sometimes working with the affordances (Gibson 1966) of the space and at other times disrupting norms that are already set up. This kind of moving can be met with different affective and physical responses by people passing by, such as halting, observing, avoiding, studiously ignoring, smiling, talking, filming, and mirroring. This interaction, we propose, stimulates ‘a form of weaving that encompasses the minutiae of the interiority of the body, but also expands to the effects of space and place’ (Schiller and Rubidge: 2014, 4).

On a macro scale, Barbour, Kloetzel, and Hunter (2019a) chart the relationship between local site dance practices and global issues such as land ownership and access; regeneration and gentrification; ecological concerns; and gender oppression for example (8-13). Each of these conditions appeared in the practice of *enter & inhabit* as part of its micro-project for *Sensing the City*. Regeneration was visibly evident in the widespread building works in the city centre due to the growth of Coventry University and the parallel preparations for City of Culture, with Garrett Brown noting: ‘Connections between old and new …Coventry over-writing itself’ (journal entry, May 2018). The place of the *enter & inhabit* artists within the cultural and university domain could have the effect of contributing to the official acceptability of the work in the space – seen when the collective cited City of Culture or displayed a university access card alleviated concerns about the group’s playful behaviour. Ecological concerns were not far from the surface, producing interactions with the rubbish dropped on the city streets, with piles of cans and plastic wrappers gathered together in installations, paper chip wrappers incorporated into movement, and road salt containers lifted to reveal discarded takeaways. One day, a sketch of a car on the ground and re-arranged with other found objects such as sweet wrappers and leaves, echoing notions of Coventry as a city for cars associated with pollution.

The visible lingering of women in busy spaces is a gendered act, with Meehan noting in her journal in March 2018: ‘Not doing much in a busy site/ Goes against the grain/ Women in public spaces/ Loitering with no good reason’. This experience of women in the city was reiterated throughout labs and salons, in terms of ‘women misbehaving’ or ‘occupying space’ (Poynor, July 2019), ‘women with splayed legs/ spreading, are they offensive?’ (Voris and Meehan, January 2020) or ‘women moving / placing yourself somewhere unusual’ (Garrett Brown, May 2018). Moving playfully and publically as women in the city sometimes provoked uneasy feelings and censorship of actions, and at other times, enjoyable defiance. Gendered interactions emerge in response to overt and lively women dancing on the streets, with one man, for example, calling out ‘Chuck it about, love!’ Although this comment colloquially has almost sexist connotations, with a meaning of overtly parading the female body in public, it also appeared to express a somewhat joyful way of connecting with public female display where there was little other easily accessible language to reach for.

The concession of who is allowed to move through space in playful could also be associated with whiteness, as assessed by site dance artist Olive Bieringa (2009, 138), who notes: ‘I have the privilege of being white and can therefore choose my invisibility.’ One day during the *enter & inhabit* practice, a young black man filmed the group, commenting with laughter to his friend on the phone: ‘Look, white women dancing!’ This reframes the activity in how it might be perceived as both gendered and racialised. It also brings to awareness how the group felt enabled to move in the space, for the majority of the time without restriction, albeit with occasional suspicion and irritation. Likewise, in the November 2019 salon, Nese Tosun asks: ‘who is entitled to play in the city?’ The space may not always have explicit boundaries on behaviour but they are however recognised by factors such as citizen glances, comments and reports, as well as occasional police interference. Several times, police approached the group to question the activity, impressing that it was from curiosity rather than concern; on one occasion there was a more assertive challenge to the activities when it happened to pass onto police territory. The awareness of how the group are enabled to move and how this is perceived by others, brings attention to the ‘multiple and diverse embodied experiences and knowledges [that] urban space entails … mobilised through multiple and diverse material practices of planning, building, dismantling, trading, walking and dancing’ (Noxolo 2018, 808).

Site dance practice brings an opportunity to reflect on city activity, with the ‘dramatic shifts in population distribution from rural to urban locales’ (Hunter, Kloetzel and Barbour 2019b, 3.) Those dance artists referenced here, such as Reeve, Poynor, Kramer and Kneale, have developed a relationship with Coventry through artist projects and residencies, but their primary interest extends beyond the city. Bringing interoceptive, exteroceptive and proprioceptive awareness to city spaces can provide a way to take stock and gain insights on the experiences of city life, where a majority of the population are living and working. *enter & inhabit’s* focus on ‘sites of flow and transition’ feels especially pertinent due to Coventry’s history of radical regeneration and major changes since the inception of the Sensing the City project in 2017. Site dance can provide ‘a lens through which we might attend to the particularities of site and place as opposed to being swept along by the ever-mobile nature of 24-hour cityscapes’ (Hunter, Kloetzel and Barbour (2019b, 4). Slowing down, stopping and resting in the busy city of Coventry were tactics undertaken by *enter & inhabit*, as a means to come to understand, interrupt and shift the city experience – pointing to the pace of life in the city but also to the rapidity of the changing city landscape. On the other hand, dynamic action also evolved as *enter & inhabit* amplified the tempo of the environment, featuring ‘fluid outpourings’ of motion, ‘flow of dancing’, and ‘effortless momentum’ (Voris, journal notes, March 2019) which joined in with the restless circulation of cars, buses and pededtrian commuters around the ringroad. The idea, then, is not just to soothe the senses through slowing down, but rather to *notice* through the body in a way that calls attention to history, attitudes, behaviours as well as the built environment in the city, while acting out ways of being in relation to these.

**Movements of urban design and planning**

Britto and Jacques’ (2014, 57) note that ‘the relationship between body and city, between flesh and stone, between the human body and urban space, has been hugely neglected in the history of urban planning.’ They suggest that there is a need to ‘subvert the logic of city-as-spectacle that currently permeates contemporary urban planning’ (46), which focuses on statement buildings that attract visitor attention. Spectacular dance in the city also takes part in this economy of making sites attractive and exciting, drawing audiences and making the city feel momentarily enlivened. Rather than focusing on animation of the city, the *enter and inhabit* practice made apparent the ways in which the built environment shapes activities and how people are implicitly allowed to act in it. While conceptual analyses of city life that focus on the body abound, urban geographer Noxolo (2018, 804) asserts in her discipline that ‘actual dance practice should inform geographical thought around urban movement much more thoroughly’, including ‘greater collaboration with the wide range of dance practitioners and scholars.’ Situated dance like the work of *enter & inhabit* undertakes practice as research studies of the city which gather experiential knowledge has much to offer urban design and planning practices. More often than not, as Brown (2015, 204) suggests, these ‘important experiences of place can be ignored by the dominant stakeholders in urban development’ (204). These experiences, of course, do not just refer to that of artists and city planners, but also to that of city inhabitants more generally. This need to take into account experiences of the city by local communities in planning is echoed by Bicquelet-Lock (2019), who notes that ‘Sometimes just focusing on the experience itself can help to provide the first hand example of what people are going through. And I think that this is where non-traditional research methods actually can help us’ (Bicquelet-Lock, 2019). In the case of dance, what might these methods look like that gather experiences of the city to alter practices of urban design and planning?

While it is not yet common practice for dance artists to feed into urban design and planning, historical precedents for such an approach do exist. Lawrence Halprin is well known for his exploration of work architecture, design and planning in the 1960s and 70s through a collaboration with his wife, dance artist Anna Halprin. Together they evolved the RSVP cycles that Voris and Garrett Brown (following Poynor) have invested in the practice. One part of the cycle is the development of scores that he notes (2014, 40 are a way ‘of making process visible’ with the aim being that ‘scores will lead into new ways of designing and planning large-scale environments of regions and large communities’. The iterative approach of the RSVP cycle facilitates participatory feed-in to the design process offering one way to a achieve what Karim (2018) calls ‘a critical investigation of how different forms of spatial knowledge are being produced and exchanged among various stakeholders’ (xxxiv). As salon conversations with contributing artists Spanton [Insert N13.] and Wookey [Insert N14.] indicated, contemporary projects that sit at the intersection of arts and planning practices exist that emphasise the role of local participants in the process. Spanton draws on participatory arts practices alongside her expertise as a trained urban planner to work with communities to co-design their local public spaces. She notes that it ‘would not be common to planning practice at all is to talk about the local community as being experts in their own place’ (salon, March 2019). One of her current project engages community participants in the area of Abram in Wigan, Greater Manchester to develop a neighbourhood plan. This is done by facilitating policy development alongside arts based approaches exloring photography and community history, to build trust, develop key themes and visualise them. Similarly Wookey’s work in city-based public arts projects begins to demonstrate the value of an embodied approach to the mapping of space and place. In a project commissioned by the Community Redevelopment Agency in downtown Los Angeles, Wookey developed a series of tours and a pocket guide for people to experience the city as a pedestrian, which is generally traversed through motorised vehicles. The activities included developing simple games such as walking backwards or panning with the gaze up and down buildings to notice the environment, with input from community groups from the local neighbourhood. However such interventions are currently the exception in the wider landscape of methodologies used. Here we try to tease out some key areas that can be tackled by dance in urban design and planning such as the choreography of power, participation, qualitative design, three dimensional planning and emergent cities. We examine this through the lens of the *enter & inhabit* practice, with the aim of understanding how long-term changes might be made.

Noxolo (2018) emphasises the extended use of the concept of ‘choreography’ in geography and urban planning, to raise questions about who plays the role of choreographer of a space and what is the choreographic process, emphasising postcolonial and decolonial theories. She refers to the ‘structures of power that condition individual mobility’ (Noxolo, 801), which is set down by the dominant ‘choreographers’ of the space and the ways in which movement is therefore shaped by the material choreography of the spatial infrastructure and interactions. In the case of the city of Coventry, the key choreographers could, for example, be identified as city planners, the city council, police force, university and cultural organisations, as well as those who live in the city who may form counterpoints to the ‘prescribed’ choreography of city spaces at times. For example, in working on front of the city’s police station regularly, *enter & inhabit* tested the edges of the kinds of behaviour that were permissible in promity to police headquarters. There was a play with the power of surveillance, as police walked towards the group or observed from heights. At one point, police staff began mimicking *enter & inhabit’s* movements from their offices. The group of dancers waved at the police who then realised they were being observed undertaking ‘unusual’ behaviour, and rapidly dispersed away from their window (November 2019).

Like the Halprins, *enter and inhabit’s* practice focuses on scores as a form of choreography that underlies the work, proffering an open and flexible framework for engaging with the city's material environments and local populations. Scoring as part of *enter & inhabit’s* work can offer a means to record the sense of the city, to make it visible and use it as a living road map, with ongoing revisions being made. As an approach, *enter & inhabit’s* practice also aims to be open such that it is not imposing a rehearsed sequence of choreographed moves onto the environment. Instead, it is working with the site which informs the choreographic score that then supports a better understanding of the city’s own inherent movement. The choreography of power embedded in the infrastructure and interactions in the city, therefore become apparent as described by the scores, image making and artist journal entries, in terms of the choreography of the city’s pathways, pacing, qualities, barriers, and surveillance; as well as describing ways that amplify or counteract these characteristics.

Choreographies of power in the city are also concerns for Bicquelet-Lock, in addressing planning priorities in inclusive health and wellbeing and the lack of affordable housing, for example. She points to the pressing need for a breadth of stakeholder engagement capable of representing the plurism of city inhabitants, noting that ‘We’re very much interested in issues around inclusion and diversity, so perhaps this is where your work comes in. How do we plan to accommodate different needs?’ (Bicquelet-Lock, 2019). Here, Bicquelet-Lock aligns with Cook (2020), Kim (2018) and organisations such as the Centre for Urban Design and Mental Health, all of whom highlight the urgent need to engage with a broader spectrum of society and experience. Arguably only by doing this will planning and urban design avoid the homogenic tendency to foreground an imagined normative citizen (white, able bodied, male and economically stable). To do so, however is not without its challenges. As Bicquelet-Lock notes there are the practical barriers to negotiate regarding citizen’s resources to engage (time and financial), and consideration is needed as to when in the process to consult with the comunity so that the activity is not received as an ‘empty’ exercise simply reaffirming predetermined decisions. Further, she presents the challenges around communication currently encountered in community participation in planning, noting that:

…people themselves often do not like change in their communities and when they are faced with new planning applications or participatory exercises, they can become very antagonistic. Violence towards planners [for example], raises a host of issues with planners in themselves suffering from mental health problems because they have been under attack … So, it’s not that easy to negotiate participation in the planning process. (Bicquelet-Lock, 2019, Interview Transcript)

The role of trust and relationship building within any participatory process for planning is highlighted, and relatedly responsibility once communities have given their time and commitment to any planning or urban design process. She notes that: ‘It’s also about once you've involved people in types of participation, how there's also a sense of accountability: what is it that you actually did with what you said you would do?’ (Bicquelet-Lock, 2019). In the *enter & inhabit* practice, the interaction with people was through participation in city life experiences, creative negotiation in space, and inquisitive conversations, all of which provided rich information on how the city feels and what it allows. As mentioned, the movement practice helped to understand the qualitative ‘feel’ of the railway station as a place of transience and overwhelm, despite well-intentioned plans to open up the space. Dwelling as an activity was not generally taking place (with the group regularly being asked ‘are you ok?) – and in a period when shopping is in decline in city centres, planners will likely want to understand what keeps people dwelling in city centres. Conversations also drew attention to the kinds of sites people liked and were attached to such as the old tree or the closed off river areas, suggesting zones that planners could develop based on citizen preferences. Less confrontational in nature, it might offer indirect ways of finding out from inhabitants how the city is experienced, and how it might be adapted. The practice does not try to target specific stakeholder groups but engages with whoever happens to pass through the sites of activity. Meeting with temporary communities of place avoids essentialising the characteristics of specific groups, where they are located and what they might need. At the same time, working in particular sites which are through-flows of pedestrian and motor traffic in the city tends to capture those engaging in their daily activities.

Questions remain about how to facilitate a major shift in urban design and planning that addresses the value of physical immersion in site and the knowledge of dance artists in garnering experiential insights. Cosgrave and Bingham-Hall (2019, 14) suggest that dance has the ‘potential for introducing new ways of working into the engineering of urban mobility’, through working with dance as an analytical tool for how movement happens in the city or in creating new ways to design in the city. They indicate that there is a current limitation in the field in understanding how to design the qualitative facets of engineering design such as making a space ‘welcoming’ (4); and another concern is how to shift from two dimensional inscriptions of space into representing the three-dimensionality of spatial organisation that might allow for further interdisciplinary understanding (12-13). Although urban engineering is not to be conflated with urban planning, both discplines work together on different elements of city plans such as infrastructure which can be supported by qualitative factors and three-dimensional processes. Inspiring by artists and researchers in site dance, *enter & inhabit* offers a practice as research, dance-led approach to exploring how the city qualitatively feels, shared through improvised dance practice, scores, journaling, image making, as well as labs and salons. The practice currently engages with somatic approaches which not only describe and represent how a space is experienced but also three-dimensionally immerses artists, architects, designers and planners in the city experience and provides practically different ways by which to understand it. There is an argument to be made here for *starting* the design process three dimensionally with bodies in space, rather than with two dimensional plans. The practice induces planners and designers to take time walking and experiencing a city over time in different conditions (season, time of day) as a means to understanding how to create cities for living, working and playing in.

Urban planning and design could also be developed to deal with the city as a space of change, in contrast with being primarily engaged with completing development projects. Such planning would consider how spaces might continually be renewed over time – enhanced by creating welcoming and adaptable spaces for dwelling and creativity. This would also mean long-term planning for what the city invents for itself – for example, relishing skate-boarding and biking activities in the city. Recent articles have addressed how group dance and movement activities organised by local citizens have overtaken sites in Chinese cities, especially ‘Yangge’, a traditional folk dance. However, councils and planning authorities have rarely adapted to accommodate these needs and desires to take over public space, largely by groups of older women. Chen (2018) makes a case for planning that responds to the wish for spaces that accommodate the popular dance activities to provide social outlets as well as raising physical activity levels of older generations, rather than moving them on as is often the case.

Jayne and Leung (2014, 266) further articulate ways in which citizens have responded to changes in Chinese state policy around public movement, as well as finding ways to deal with contemporary city life, through dance and massage. They describe public dance variously as a means to escape high rise apartment blocks, experience playfulness and creativity, and engage in ‘sensory, physical and social experiences between bodies and the city itself’ (260). Although massage is not part of the *enter & inhabit* practice, it does have resonances in how Jayne and Leung describe touch as a way of generating intimacy and release for overwrought bodies in the city (263). Attending to what a city’s populations are doing, could provide clues as to how inhabitants might wish to experience in the city, and how this can then be planned for. The *enter & inhabit* practice explores a way of understanding how people sense, feel and act in the city, gathering information on how the city evolves by itself, and therefore information for city planners who wish to understand how to respond to a living and growing city. This is not about increasing the pace of city re-building, which has recently been a characteristic of the city of Coventry, rather it is about planning for cities that can shift and adapt with the population’s preferred activities.

Scharmer (2016, 8) asks: ‘How can we learn to better sense and connect with a future possibility that is seeking to emerge and how can we access, activate, and enact the deeper layers of generative social fields?’ Although building from the past of what is known, he suggests that it is possible to learn from the future of what is emerging. Understanding how to sense is one way by which to tap into this emergence. In this micro-project, much of this was done by literally ‘entering’ and ‘inhabiting’ through a detailed situated movement practice and attempting to articulate the material processes and practices experienced. This process, however, is not ‘unplanned’ – for example, *enter &inhabit* works with a practiced set of methods that prioritise receptivity, reflection and returning over time. It could be considered that ‘emergence’ is the key factor for engaging with the city and city dwellers, where attending through duration and process allows a direction to form. Reeve notes that inviting a sense of uncertainty into the creative process is an important principle of emergence, noting her intention ‘to keep the creative process inclusive and open to change for as long as possible (without descending into chaos) in order to allow it to crystallise its own ‘product’(2008, 83). [Insert N15.] To that end, the *enter & inhabit* practice promotes an openness to the site of investigation. The process involves both prior experiences and the ‘soaking up’ of the environment’s atmosphere, which result in reflection and action (or inaction) in the space. It is impossible to spend weeks sensing in the streets without noticing the lack of green spaces, air and noise pollution, poverty and homelessness, regeneration and gentrification, and surveillance, amongst other issues. What this dance practice can offer is to highlight these issues in a creative manner, while the micro-project also works toward building networks and platforms from which to make change, such as through the salons. There was also a desire to avoid conceptual thinking being laid down by one discipline and delivered by another – often with the arts being seen as the mode of action as opposed to the way of thinking through problems. However, the micro-project labs and salons are envisaged as a live debate rather than a readily reusable singular model. Since a prerequisite of the work is immersed investment in a changing city landscape, the suggestion is that the methods of labs and salons can spark others to explore, depending on the variables of the site, as an interaction between local dance artists, public participants and city planners.

# Conclusions

In this chapter, we have provided a framing for the Moving and Mapping micro-project in Sensing the City, foregrounding the situated dance practice of *enter & inhabit*. Cyclical, iterative, reflective and processual engagements with sites were undertaken, with attention to sensing, feeling, action and perception. Returning to the initial research questions, this practice has revealed how Coventry as a city moves or limits movement by different groups; it has shown up social and cultural issues around how space is occupied and perceived; and how power in space is choreographed. Through a set of labs and salons, the project explored how situated dance can produce ways of knowing place and collaborative, interdisciplinary ways of responding to the challenges of cities in the 21st Century. Currently, it is suggested, the capacities of the body are not understood to their fullest potential in urban design and planning. For example, giving close attention to the detail of moving in and through the city; the sound of the city at different times of day; the textures and gradients of the pavement; the flow and rhythm of the underpass; exits and entrances in and out of the city centre; places of rest; ease of pathways (or not) all serve to draw out the significance of the lived experience of city navigation.

The starting point for future recommendations would be to regard dance artists as ‘expert-notators’ of space and time who therefore could become valuable contributors to urban design and planning teams, so that interdisciplinary working become the norm. But perhaps more importantly the work has shown that those that navigate and live in the city know the city through their bodies, and therefore have important insights into what kinds of design and planning may be appropriate. Put another way, cities are full of expert dwellers and inhabitants and thus the question for future approaches to urban design and planning becomes one concerned with how best to engage with populations as co-designers and to make conscious this existing knowledge. And here we propose situated dance can be one tool to solicit inhabitants’ experiential and imaginary relationship to the city. Building relationships with city dwellers in creative ways might aid in tackling issues around the participatory design of cities, with an emphasis on emergence over time and less directive processes. Of course there is a challenging gap to be bridged between the work of planners, who are subject to local or national priorities, and the work of experimental, independent artists or even university-based researchers. City councils are required to balance needs such as funding constraints, delivery time-scales, existing legal contracts, developer agendas and planning permission timelines. Important to a shift in paradigm would be the expertise of people such as Sarah Spanton who can bring together dual competencies in the arts *and* urban planning. In the meantime, there is scope for planners to work with dance artists and researchers, as a step towards making longer term change in the qualitative design of a city through three dimensional planning, as well as providing alternative ideas around participatory practice.

Writing this chapter at a time of lockdown internationally during the COVID-19 pandemic, raises questions about the role of practice as research projects in urban design and planning that promote sensing the city, based on notions of moving through city spaces, in proximity to others, and touching the environment. On the one hand, the pandemic is prompting dance and walking artists are considering the way their skills in navigating spaces as valuable for others. [Insert N16.] On the other hand, it creates obvious challenges for introducing sensate practices into urban design and planning, which would be less risky if confined to desk-based designs and plans undertaken at a remove from the sensorial experience of sites. It is difficult to know right now what kinds of movement will be return in public space in time, as well as what long-term impacts there will be on cities. An increase in home working and online shopping could be further accelerated, altering how much people interact with the city environment in future. At the same time, the expertise of dance artists will be of value in coming to terms with how people begin to move in space again, especially with the personal and social issues caused by isolation and fears of touch. Further, dance artists can work with city planners to imagine what cities need following the pandemic, by noticing how people start to inhabit space differently, and working with what is emerging to facilitate what the city wants to become.

**End Notes**

N1. The Moving and Mapping micro-project was led by Natalie Garrett Brown and Emma Meehan. However, a large part was focused on the work of the collective *enter & inhabit* which also includes dance-artist Amy Voris and photographer Christian Kipp. We therefore wish to acknowledge their input on ideas in the project and the chapter. Meehan and Garrett Brown led in writing the chapter and framing it within the wider Sensing the City project. Voris also contributed writing to some sections, while Kipp was central to devising materials for the e-Resource.

N2. Embodiment in this chapter is understood to mean bringing attention to a holistic experience of moving through space which integrates ‘mind, body, feelings and one’s internal/external worlds of experience’ (Bloom 2006 cited in Fischman and Koch 2011: 4). We draw on helpful references here from the domains of body psychotherapy and dance movement psychotherapy, however this chapter focuses on the related but distinct field of somatic practices, described later.

N3. For clarity, we will refer to the Sensing the City project, Moving and Mapping micro-project and *enter & inhabit* collective as distinct albeit interrelated entities. We also refer to the *enter & inhabit* practice as the activities that form the basis of their approach.

N4. The four lab dance artists include Hilary Knepl9ik ale, Paula Kramer, Helen Poynor and Sandra Reeve. Salon and interview participants include Alice Sara, Annette Arlander, Ashleigh Bowmott (née Griffith), Aude Bicquelet-Lock, Cara Davies, Caroline Salem, Dani Abulhawa, Ed Frith, Erica Charalambous, Helen Roby, Jo Shore, Katye Coe, Lily Hayward Smith, Marie Louise Crawley, Rachel Sara, Sabine Coady Schaebitz, Sara Wookey, Sarah Rubidge, Sarah Spanton, and Victoria Hunter; along with the Sensing the City project members.

N5. The latter part of the score is an echo of a scores set by Helen Poynor during a lab day in July 2019. However, Sandra Reeve and Paula Kramer also worked with the concept of ‘receiving’ during labs in March 2018? The concept of ‘receiving’ is also informed by the work of Suprapto Suryodarmo with whom they have all worked.

N6. see enterinhabit.com for further information.

N7. The UK Independent Dance sector emerged out of the New Dance lineage in the 1970s and ‘80s, which itself emerged out of dialogues with the creative experimentation of the Judson Church group in 1960s New York.

N8. For further discussion the RSVP process and Halprin’s work more generally see Poynor, H, & Worth, L, (2004) & Poynor (2009). The original articulation of this process can be found in Halprin, L. (1969)

N9. The term ‘processual’ is informed by the work of artist-scholar Jane Bacon who has advocated for the development of practice-driven, process-oriented research methodologies within the context of artistic research (2019).

N10. See <https://www.bodymindcentering.com/taking-individual-courses/> for a further overview of the areas of study.

N11. The term ‘felt-sense’ was coined by psychologist and philosopher Eugene Gendlin as follows: ‘A felt-sense is not a mental experience but a physical one […] A body awareness of a situation, person, or event. An internal aura that encompasses everything you feel and know about the given subject at a given time – encompasses it and communicates it to you all at once rather than detail by detail. Think of it as a taste, if you like, or a great musical chord […]’ (1978/2003: 32).

N12. See Garrett Brown, N (2015) Strategies of Interruption: Slowing Down and Becoming Sensate in Site Responsive Dance. In Hunter, V. (ed) Moving Sites: Investigating Site-Specific Dance, UK, Routledge for an earlier discussion of the political potential of *enter & inhabit.*

N13. See <https://www.waymarking.org.uk> for an overview of Spanton’s work.

N14. For example see this project by Wookey <http://sarawookey.com/portfolio/being-pedestrian/>

N15. Social justice facilitator Adrienne Maree Brown (2017) develops a set of exciting tools for ‘emergent strategy’ that resonate with the work developed here, and which we aspire to, including non-linear and iterative practice.

N16. See for example, <https://www.triarchypress.net/virus.html> and <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/31/arts/dance/choreographing-the-street-coronavirus.html>
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