1 Introduction: Reconceptualising Emotion

> Saturday, 2 p.m., and I'm on the way to 'the match', a walk I've done hundreds of times. I cross the road and the steel girders at the top of the nineteenth-century stadium rise out of the tight-knit terraced housing that envelops this iconic structure that has shaped so many dreams, desires, hopes, and fears. With every footstep, my sense of anticipation and excitement rises. I enter the stadium and hit a wall of sound – a cacophony of chants, cheers, and jeers as the familiar songs reverberate around the stadium. I take my seat and my individual responses to the physical environment are immediately drawn into a collective sense of belonging – of 'my' and 'our' team as we join together to support the club. Over the course of the next two hours, my senses are alive, and I run through a range of emotional responses – anger, joy, fear, sadness, and pride each congeal into an emotional blur that both merges with and diverges from the emotions of others within the same stadium. The stadium and its surrounds fizz with emotional energy.
>
> This walk, this stadium, and these experiences rush back to me as I read several stories of stadium closures as clubs seek to modernise through demolition and relocation. I think about this in the context of 'my' stadium and a wave of complex emotions run through me. I start to turn over the memories in my mind, I immerse myself in the collective folklore, I wonder about the other fans, I trace the words of the songs, I visualise the goals, the saves, and the near misses, and as I do so my mind and body unite in a sense of longing – to return, to replay, to revive. I'm now geographically distant but remain emotionally entangled. In this moment all my experiences merge and my profound emotional attachment to this 100-year-old stadium, with all its attendant memories and stories, becomes viscerally obvious to me.

This vignette captures why I wanted to explore why historic places matter emotionally. I know that we, individually and collectively, develop emotional relationships to certain places but I also know that it is difficult to explain why we feel this way, and even harder to recognise within heritage practice. This stadium is not listed, it is afforded no official historical or architectural value, but to the hundreds of thousands of people who enter through the turnstiles each year it has a value that sits outside of heritage designation. A sceptical reader could say that my experience is atypical yet there is a significant body of evidence that suggests that sporting spaces do elicit strong emotions (Archer and Wildman, 2021). However, I have not shared my experience with you to add to this literature. Instead, I have shared this as a personal memory based on my lived and felt experiences of this place, separate from my professional life. Other examples are found in our everyday environment.

> A completely undistinguished street of terraced houses builds up over the years a considerable symbolic potential, as though it absorbs the innumerable discharges of emotional energy released in forgotten day to day transactions. For the inhabitants of that street, the architecture and all the other urban

> impediments, provide symbolic depth to life; through grimy bricks and flaming mortar the past retains the breath of life. (Smith, 1975: 77)

In the context of iconic heritage sites, we can look to the outpourings of grief attached to the fires at the Category A listed Glasgow School of Art (Figure 1) and the World Heritage Site of Notre Dame, Paris. Images of people gathering to mourn the loss of these buildings and process their grief circulated through global media outlets. The fact that so many people stood in shock, cried uncontrollable tears, and then waged a fraught battle over the most appropriate ways to reconstruct these two buildings demonstrated that, for these people, these two historic places mattered emotionally. If we put these examples alongside the stadium and the terraced houses, we can see that 'historic' can include places that are both officially designated as listed buildings or in conservation areas as well as those that are unlisted.

Throughout this Element, you will read about many different historic places, but my hope is that you can filter them through and/or add in your own emotional relationships that you have with your places. You may instead recall the clock under which social rendezvous were made, the cafe in which lunch was shared, the bingo hall in which fortunes were won and lost, or the high street that shaped weekend rhythms and rituals. Some of these relationships remain hidden and highly personal while others are revealed across cultural genres. For example, Wordsworth's poems reveal his emotional relationship with the Lake District, the sights, sounds, and smells of Salford are conveyed through the song lyrics in 'Dirty Old Town', while the lived and felt reality of life in Rome comes through the films of Pier Paolo Pasolini and Federico Fellini. Emotion, and our emotional relationships with places, is therefore omnipresent and inescapable. It rests in our memories and experiences, it is in the news bulletins that flash up in front of us, the poems we read, the music we listen to, the films we watch, the streets we walk down, the buildings we visit, and the green spaces we relax in. Yet we rarely question why these emotional relationships between us and our places occur. In fact, with a few obvious exceptions (Lowenthal and Binney, 1981; Lowenthal, 2013; Page, 2016; Mayes, 2018), we have, in a Western context, rarely questioned why we conserve historic places, believing as Ashworth did, that the 'why ask "why" question is improper'. Rather, the retention of historic buildings is seen as a 'self-evident contribution to the betterment of this and future generations' (Ashworth, 1997: 95). Instead, we have turned to quantifying the economic and social value of historic places, most notably in the United Kingdom through the Heritage Counts series produced by Historic England and

Figure 1 View showing the fire damaged south-west corner of the Mackintosh Building.

Source: Canmore, Historic Environment Scotland: DP 189507 © Crown Copyright: HES. All Rights Reserved.

internationally through a series of reports produced by the Getty Institute. I suggest therefore that within this continual need to demonstrate the values of heritage we have perhaps lost sight of why historic places matter at a deeper level. As such, this Element asks the 'why' question.

Exploring Emotion

The evidence informing this Element is drawn from a four-year research project which used emoji workshops, place-based oral histories, and extant material such as planning documents, heritage policies, press releases, and a series of reports designed to prevent the loss of historic urban places to explore why historic places matter emotionally. This data covered urban areas in England and Scotland since 1975 and was collected with a clear focus on accessing the emotional dimensions of historic urban places.[1]

Emotion was built into the research design in three main ways. First, by focusing on urban change. Second, the sources and methods for data collection were chosen to prioritise emotions. Third, emotion was coded in the data analysis.

Urban Change

Urban change was used as a mechanism through which emotion would be revealed. This was based on the belief that 'so long as there is no suggestion of change, no perception of threat' then the meanings invested in a place 'tend to remain implicit and unexpressed' (Miller, 2003: 29). This view was supported by English Heritage (2008: 32), which stated that the 'social values of place . . . may only be articulated when the future of a place is threatened'. In line with this thinking, three distinct types of urban change were examined.

First, the Element engages with the consequences of urban renewal for historic places within English cities in the latter decades of the twentieth century. This period was marked by sustained campaigns to prevent the demolition of historic places across Europe and the UK, as demonstrated by the inception of European Architectural Heritage Year and SAVE Britain's Heritage, both in 1975. SAVE was founded 'by a group of planners, architects and journalists in reaction to the destruction of historic buildings, with the clear sense that their concern was shared by the wider public, and that the press could be encouraged to articulate this concern' (Wilkinson, 2006: 108). This focus on preventing demolition is primarily demonstrated by a linguistic and thematic analysis of published reports by SAVE Britain's Heritage in the 1970s and 1980s in the capital city of London along with Bradford, Burnley, Gateshead,

[1] The project that these findings sit within was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (Grant Reference: AH/P007058/1). The work was supported by three project partners: Historic Environment Scotland, "the lead public body set up to investigate, care for and promote Scotland's historic environment" (https://www.historicenvironment.scot/about-us/); Montagu Evans LLP, "an independent property consultancy owned and run by a group of partners" (https://www.montagu-evans.co.uk/about/) and SAVE Britain's Heritage, "campaigns to bring new life to threatened historic buildings of all types and ages" (https://www.savebritainsheritage.org/about)

Halifax, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, and Newcastle. Each of these northern cities were suffering from decay and decline of the historic environment along with the socio-economic impacts of deindustrialisation.

Second, the Element covers the switch to heritage-led regeneration schemes co-ordinated by the public sector during the first two decades of the twenty-first century. This was achieved by exploring Historic Environment Scotland's Conservation Area Regeneration Scheme (CARS), which ran from 2007 to 2025 and provided a 'grant of up to £2 million to support cohesive heritage-focused community and economic growth projects within Conservation Areas across Scotland'. In addition, CARS was expected to

> deliver a combination of larger building repair projects, small third-party grant schemes providing funding for repairs to properties in private ownership, activities that promote community engagement with the local heritage and training for professionals in traditional building skills, all of which will contribute to sustainable economic and community development within the Conservation Area[2].

Here, the evidence is primarily drawn from emoji workshops held with local residents in the historic towns of Campbeltown, Kirriemuir, Paisley, Rothesay, and Selkirk in Scotland. Each area contains a significant number of listed buildings relative to population size, suffered from decay and decline in the historic environment, and received CARS funding between 2007 and 2022.

Third, the Element covers the role of private-sector-led regeneration of historic places in the first two decades of the twenty-first century. This is primarily demonstrated through the analysis of place-based oral histories and extant planning documents concerning the masterplan-led regeneration of the former Royal Infirmary site in Edinburgh, located within the boundaries of the Edinburgh World Heritage Site. The nineteen-acre site is now a mixed-use development called Quartermile and includes a mix of listed buildings and new buildings.

Together there are three types of urban change in fifteen places across England and Scotland including two capital cities, eight cities, and five smaller urban areas. As such, it is possible to analyse the ways in which different types of urban change affect the ways in which people across England and Scotland express why historic places matter emotionally to them.

Sources and Methods

The sources and methods for data collection were chosen to prioritise emotions. This was achieved both through extant and newly created data. The extant data was

[2] https://www.historicenvironment.scot/grants-and-funding/our-grants/previous-programmes/conservation-area-regeneration-scheme-cars/

mainly comprised of planning documents along with publications by SAVE Britain's Heritage. Most notably, eleven reports that focused on threatened historic places across the north of England and in London. Following the theory of 'urban change' just outlined, these reports were chosen for temporal and spatial reasons. These reports were written over a seven-year period right at the start of SAVE's existence (1979–86) when pressure to demolish historic places was acute, due to a combination of socio-economic factors including deindustrialisation, depopulation, obsolescence, and market forces. The reports were one of the 'main weapons in the SAVE armoury' (Wilkinson, 2006: 108) and were designed to both document threats to existing buildings and to provide alternative options for re-using historic buildings. As such, these reports outline both the process of preventing demolition and the emotional impacts of the perception and reality of loss. In addition, these reports were written in situ from SAVE's two offices, one in the North of England and one in London, to ensure that the authors were connecting local issues to broader national campaigns. Together, this material provides an insight into how the threat and reality of demolition reveals why these places matter emotionally.

In addition to this extant material, new data was created through adaptations of oral histories and focus group methods. The method of oral histories was adapted to focus on place and profession (Trower, 2011). As such, place-based oral histories, lasting on average one hour, with built environment professionals working across the urban development cycle in England and Scotland, were conducted. These oral histories focused on emotion and change over the career of built environment professionals and included both a focused case study (Quartermile, Edinburgh) and others that concentrated on place-based development in general across England and Scotland. The material produced by built environment professionals was complemented with the voices and feelings of residents within smaller urban areas in Scotland through adapting the traditional focus group method into emoji workshops. This method developed from an earlier photo-elicitation method (Madgin et al., 2016) as it incorporated emojis alongside photos and maps of historic places. A fuller description of the methodological approach can be found in a collection dedicated to innovative methods for place attachment (Madgin and Lesh, 2021).[3] The key points are outlined here. Six workshops were held and were comprised of four parts:

1. Photo-emoji elicitation: images of historic places were accompanied by seven responses: 🙂 = happy; 😃 = very happy; 😢 = sad; 😭 = very sad; 😡

[3] Discussions about Campbeltown, Kirriemuir, Paisley, Rothesay and Selkirk reference the views of local residents from the emoji workshops. All other referenced data is either from extant material and cited as such or interviews with built environment professionals. Participants are referred to by pseudonym.

= angry; 😠 = furious; 😐 = neutral. Residents were asked 'when I see this building/place I feel . . . ' and then asked to click the button on an electronic response pad that most closely corresponded with their feelings (e.g. button 1 for 🙂 = happy).

2. Historic maps: participants used post-it notes and emoji stickers to convey their feelings about places they chose on the maps
3. Aerial photos: participants used post-it notes and emoji stickers to convey their feelings about places they chose on the maps
4. 'Do-it-yourself' plaques: participants were given blank blue plaques and asked to identify anything they felt was important to them and populate with emojis.

Across each of the four methods, local residents were asked to respond to how historic urban places made them feel individually and then collectively by discussing their different emojis with the rest of the group. The point of using emojis was not to elicit statistically significant quantitative data. Whether 90 per cent of participants stated that they felt 'happy' in relation to a particular place was not the focus of the workshops, which lasted, on average, two hours. Instead, the emojis stimulated long and expansive discussions about why people had chosen their emojis, contextual data about the look, feel, and use of place, and saw rich conversations between participants, which drove to the heart of why their places mattered to them emotionally.

Data Analysis

Finally, emotion was coded in the data analysis. This was achieved by adopting a linguistic and thematic analysis of a range of different sources including extant material such as planning documents, press releases, reflective texts, and reports, primarily written by SAVE Britain's Heritage in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, along with the newly created material (i.e. the transcripts of place-based oral histories and emoji workshops). This included privileging the presence of emotion in the voices of the participants by analysing the emotion words either spoken by local residents and built environment professionals or written in existing documents. Through this, their emotional registers were evident. However, emotion is often downplayed and often absent from much of the rhetoric around historic urban places. As such, the material was also analysed thematically and placed into conversation with actions. In line with Sara Ahmed's (2014) question 'What Do Emotions Do?', the analysis focuses not just on what is said/written but how this is tied to decision-making in the urban environment. The approach taken was to consider how emotion is expressed through both words and actions and therefore the ways in and extent to which emotion is considered within place-based decision-making.

Alongside these approaches, a range of other sources including grey literature relevant to planning and conservation including such as international charters, national planning frameworks, national conservation guidelines, conservation area appraisals, published local history sources, and wider secondary literature were read to provide contextual data and connect to wider debates and policies. The analysis of this material forms the basis for a conceptual framework that can support an understanding of why historic urban places matter emotionally. This conceptual framework is comprised of three interlocking parts: (1) emotional responses, (2) emotional attachments, and (3) emotional communities. This framework suggests that we can understand why historic urban places matter emotionally by exploring the range of responses they provoke, the intensity of attachments they stimulate, and the types of different communities that develop a shared emotional register.

Emotion, Place, and Heritage

Understanding emotion requires shifting our thinking from seeing heritage as the historic environment to instead seeing heritage as historic places. This is not just a semantic shift. Instead, it builds from a substantial body of place-based work from across a range of disciplines that states that people and place are connected through meaning and emotion (Tuan, 1977; Altman and Low, 1992; Relph, 2008; Manzo and Devine-Wright, 2021). Yi Fu Tuan, one of the earliest exponents of this view, believed that 'the emotion felt among human beings finds expression and anchorage in things and places' (Tuan, 1979: 417). The term 'place' is therefore deliberately used in this Element to emphasise the connection between the physical and the emotional. There are innumerable definitions of place, with debates found across a number of different disciplines concerning what place is, how it differs from space, and placelessness/non-place (Cresswell, 2014). Ultimately, these definitions can be summarised as having three main elements: (1) geographic location, (2) material form, and (3) centre of meaning and value (Gieryn, 2000: 464–5). These three elements are mutually reinforcing and cannot be separated: one is not more important than the other but rather they work together, and they involve tangible forms (e.g. buildings and streets) and intangible elements (e.g. memories, symbols, rhythms, routines, and rituals). The first and second points of Gieryn's definition are well understood within heritage theory and practice. Listed buildings and conservation areas are geographic locations with material form and these aspects of the definition are therefore enshrined in the laws, policies, and practices of heritage designation and management. The third point (meaning and value) is much more complex. While values are the underpinning framework of cultural significance, it is less clear how

meaning is constructed and considered within decision-making. As such, it is this latter aspect that the Element is concerned with. This is achieved by focusing on how emotion can help us understand why historic places hold meaning and therefore matter to people.

For the purposes of this Element, meaning and therefore our emotional relationships are derived through a person's interaction with, and lived and felt experiences of, historic urban places, which include designated and non-designated places. In this understanding, historic places do not have intrinsic meaning but rather meanings are constructed through individual and collective experience and therefore are historically and culturally contingent. Meaning is therefore plural and contested, not singular and agreed, it is fluid and changes over time and between space, and it differs between people. Crucially, in this understanding, meaning cannot occur without an emotional relationship between people and place.

In developing this view, this Element engages with key themes in critical heritage studies. In particular, it is situated within an increasing body of academic work that explores the emotional dimensions of heritage sites, including rural and urban areas and museum/visitor attractions (Byrne and Nugent, 2004; Harrison, 2004; Graham et al., 2009; Gregory, 2015; Tolia-Kelly, Waterton, and Watson, 2017; Smith, 2020; Wells, 2020; Wang, 2023). This work has started to develop an understanding of emotion and moved us from a point whereby emotion was previously believed to be the 'elephant in the room of heritage and museum studies' (Smith and Campbell, 2015: 443) to something that is actively engaged with in theory and practice. Within this emerging work there is a desire to develop empirical evidence through using innovative methods that directly focus on emotion in both data collection and analysis (Madgin and Lesh, 2021). Emerging work in the field of heritage and emotion is also opening up powerful new lines of enquiry based on different theoretical positions. For example, Smith, Campbell, and Wetherall's (2018) use of 'affective practices' sits alongside the more-than-representational approaches taken by Tolia-Kelly, Waterton, and Watson (2017). This Element positions itself within this tradition and trajectory of scholarship by using original empirical evidence to critically analyse how we can understand emotion. To achieve this, it draws on insights and literatures both from within and outwith critical heritage studies, and particularly from environmental psychology and humanistic geography, to develop a framework that concentrates on three key components of emotion: responses, attachments, and communities.

In line with more recent attempts within critical heritage studies to align theories and practices, the Element is also located within the development of people-centred approaches to both heritage and planning. In a heritage context,