

BUILDINGS, EMOTIONS AND BELONGING 2026

**IGP & HUMANISE
PILOT STUDIO WORKSHOP**

INTRODUCTION



Humanise and UCL's Institute for Global Prosperity (IGP) convened the first IGP Studio workshop to explore how buildings and places affect people's emotions, sense of identity and belonging through a human-centred design approach. Hosted at Heatherwick Studio in October 2026, it brought together citizen scientists, researchers, designers, architects, developers and local authority representatives to examine these experiences through discussion.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

People's relationships with buildings and public spaces depend on belonging, memory, comfort and participation. Attractive design could inspire pride while still feeling unavailable through cost, unclear entrances or uncertainty about whether people were welcome.

Buildings carried personal and cultural meanings beyond their appearance. Familiar features and earlier uses supported attachment, while neighbourhood change could weaken those connections even when residents remained in place. Differences in care and upkeep could also communicate whose comfort mattered.

Everyday details shaped people's ability to enjoy and use places. Materials, lighting, paving and public amenities affected movement, reassurance and opportunities to stay. These responses varied with individual circumstances, cultural context and time, challenging assumptions about universally welcoming design.

Participation needed a visible connection to decisions. Early involvement offered opportunities to shape proposals, but financial constraints and changing priorities could limit influence. Explaining how contributions had been considered, including why ideas were not adopted, was important to maintaining trust.

Suggestions included embedding participation within project briefs, working through trusted organisations and broadening opportunities for younger people and anonymous contributions. These possibilities raised a continuing question: how could citizens' knowledge be preserved, built upon and used throughout design and development?



CONTENTS

01. PURPOSE AND CONTEXT	5
02. HOW BUILDINGS MAKE US FEEL: A PRESENTATION BY SAFFRON WOODCRAFT	6
03. EVIDENCE GATHERING DISCUSSIONS	8
3.1 Belonging depends on what a place offers people	8
3.2 Buildings carry meanings beyond their visual qualities	9
3.3 The quality of a place is experienced through the body	9
3.4 Design communicates care and recognition	10
3.5 Participation needs a connection to decisions	10
3.6 The experience of development begins before completion	11
04. MAKING LIVED EXPERIENCE PART OF THE EVIDENCE: A PRESENTATION BY JOSEPH COOK	12
05. THINK-PAIR-SHARE	14
5.1 Materials shape the relationship between a person and a place	14
5.2 Everyday journeys reveal how pleasure and difficulty coexist	15
5.3 Quality matters, but people recognise it in different ways	16
06. BRINGING THE INSIGHTS TOGETHER	17
6.1 Everyday details reveal questions about the wider city	17
6.2 Citizen involvement needs a place at the beginning	18
6.3 Different ways of listening can reveal different experiences	18
6.4 Existing knowledge needs to accumulate and remain visible	19



01

PURPOSE AND CONTEXT

Humanise and the Institute for Global Prosperity (IGP) convened the first pilot of the IGP Studios to explore how buildings and places affect people's emotions, sense of identity and belonging through a human-centred design approach. Hosted at Heatherwick Studio, it brought together citizen scientists, researchers, designers, architects, developers and local authority representatives to examine these experiences through discussion.

For Humanise, the workshop offered an opportunity to capture people's stories about the look and feel of their surroundings: what makes them feel proud, connected, welcome or distant from a place. For IGP, the pilot Studio provided a setting in which different experiences and forms of knowledge could inform practical ideas and help shape future collaboration.

The workshop's focus was the human experience of buildings and urban design. Personal accounts provided a starting point for exploring how appearance, materials, scale and spatial qualities acquire meaning in everyday life. The discussion also considered how those experiences relate to the decisions through which places are designed, developed and used.

This report has two purposes. The first is to explain what was learned about the relationship between buildings and human experience. The second is to capture the ideas generated and examine what material is relevant to a potential London Plan consultation submission.

02

HOW BUILDINGS MAKE US FEEL: A PRESENTATION BY SAFFRON WOODCRAFT

*Professorial Research Fellow &
Director of Social Policy at IGP*



A building can communicate something about our place in society before we ever enter it. Its materials, appearance and relationship with its surroundings can suggest that we belong, that new possibilities are opening up, or that the future being imagined is intended for somebody else. Saffron's presentation explored these messages through research on regeneration, community and everyday experience.

Drawing on her work in and around the Olympic Park since 2011, she described residents watching new towers rise and interpreting their colours and forms as signs that the homes were not for "ordinary people". Those impressions could develop without detailed knowledge of the buildings' tenure or intended occupants. Appearance itself was contributing to an understanding of

who the changing neighbourhood would accommodate.

For Saffron, belonging involved identity and recognition, inclusion and feeling valued. Community also took shape through shared routines and encounters: using the same streets, visiting familiar places and experiencing the spaces between buildings. Changes to that everyday environment could therefore have consequences beyond the development site.

She distinguished displacement from dislocation. People might remain in their homes while the neighbourhood they recognised changed around them. The disappearance of affordable, familiar places to eat or meet could weaken their connection with the area. Even development hoardings could communicate exclusion, presenting images of future communities that existing residents struggled to see themselves within.

Yet change could also create a sense of possibility. Younger people sometimes saw the arrival of educational and cultural institutions at East Bank as inspiring. Early residents of East Village described the appeal of being pioneers in a new neighbourhood. These different experiences showed why the emotional effects of development needed to be understood in context.

That attention to context extended to materials. Saffron questioned the assumption that brick necessarily conveys familiarity or comfort:

“There’s nothing inherently comforting about brick ... it’s about the context and how it’s applied. So understanding what that context is and where those ideas ... are coming from is one of the things that we really need to be able to explore.”

The presentation then turned to how these experiences could become evidence. Citizen science offered ways for residents to help frame research questions and investigate the qualities of their own environments. Examples included mapping a street through smell, documenting noise and vibration beside construction works, and exploring a bridge as a physical, psychological and economic divide.

These approaches made feelings more open to investigation. They connected sensory experience with questions of safety, familiarity, inclusion and opportunity, providing knowledge that conventional measures might overlook.

Saffron’s presentation established a central question for the workshop: how can the meanings people attach to buildings and places become part of the evidence that shapes their future?

03

EVIDENCE GATHERING DISCUSSIONS

The photograph exercise opened a discussion about how buildings become part of people's lives. Across the accounts, emotional responses involved more than appearance. They drew on whether places accommodated everyday needs, the meanings people attached to them and the experience of using their spaces.

3.1 Belonging depends on what a place offers people

The discussion explored belonging as a relationship between the qualities of a place and the opportunities people find within it. Attractive design could encourage visits and create pride, while affordability, access and permitted activities shaped whether people felt comfortable spending time there.

King's Cross illustrated this complexity. Its public spaces and activities offered ways to enjoy the area without purchasing anything. Yet the cost of shops and restaurants could make parts of the development feel distant from everyday life.

"I used to teach at UAL, so I used to go there every Monday, and it cost a fortune. You'd always have to bring a packed lunch ... it's not just what something looks like or what shape it is or what materials, [it's] the accessibility of a place in terms of actually being genuinely welcoming."

The sense of welcome also depended on how people understood the boundaries of use. An account of being challenged while taking photographs showed how management rules could change the experience of an apparently public space. Physical openness did not necessarily explain what someone was free to do there.

Participation added another dimension. Opportunities to contribute to design, enter a working studio or use a building for community activities helped people establish relationships with places. The youth centre example also revealed how lengthy delivery periods could separate involvement in design from the opportunity to benefit from the completed building.

These accounts suggested that belonging develops through the relationship between invitation and participation. Appearance helps communicate welcome, while activities, affordability and management determine how that invitation is experienced.

3.2 Buildings carry meanings beyond their visual qualities

Emotional responses were shaped by the associations people brought to buildings. Personal memories, knowledge of a place and its wider social meaning could influence how its form and materials were interpreted.

A former workplace retained an association with an unhappy period of employment. Historic buildings gained significance through understanding their earlier uses and the people connected with them. Familiar surroundings could acquire new meaning when someone learned more about their history.

“There’s an old bath house in Fulham, which is where I grew up, that they turned into a dance studio, and it’s where I learnt to dance when I was a small child. I only just found out that it used to be a bath house, and so now when I’m walking through that space I can see ... the ghost of the building that it once was before it was repurposed.”

The discussion of Canary Wharf and the Gherkin also showed why preferences could not be reduced to a particular

material. Glass buildings prompted different responses according to their shape, setting and associations. Distinctive architecture could create excitement, while visual consistency could provide another kind of pleasure.

Character mattered at the scale of a city too. Discussion of Euston raised questions about what an arrival point communicates: whether it offers warmth, identity and a sense of place alongside its practical function.

A building’s visible qualities provided part of the explanation for these responses. Their emotional significance developed through the relationship between the place, the person and the context in which they encountered it.

3.3 The quality of a place is experienced through the body

The conversation highlighted the limits of understanding buildings primarily through photographs. People described qualities that became apparent through moving, pausing, touching surfaces and encountering light, sound or activity.

The ease of moving through a building, the tranquillity of an interior and the feel of materials helped explain attachment. One account of a former abattoir in Shanghai described a connection created through its layout and the experience of following its routes.

"I felt like my brain could just switch off ... I just kind of flowed where the space directed me. ... There was something about that natural flow that really satisfied something within me and made the building something like I've never experienced before in my life."

Greenery and curved forms were associated with comfort, while the effects of larger buildings on sky, daylight and wind brought attention to the experience of surrounding spaces.

The relationship between inside and outside also involved competing needs. A translucent façade could allow passers-by to sense activity while protecting occupants' privacy. Openness could therefore be achieved through different degrees of visibility.

These examples expanded the discussion from what a building looks like to how it supports an encounter. Its felt quality emerged through the relationship between form, atmosphere, movement and use. An attractive image could convey only part of that experience.

3.4 Design communicates care and recognition

Buildings could be interpreted as signals of how people were regarded. The quality of entrances, shared spaces and everyday details carried messages about consideration, dignity and the attention given to different users.

A mixed-tenure housing example illustrated how admiration for a building's overall form could coexist with concern about differences within it. Separate entrances and contrasting communal areas suggested unequal experiences behind a shared exterior.

"It's part private and part ... social ... but you can see the private side ... they both have their own entrance, and one ... is all very beautiful with a settee and it's very well kept, and the other one is just a rather nondescript hallway leading into the properties."

Similar concerns appeared in discussion of social housing, where perceived cheapness was connected with the value placed on residents. The relationship with neighbouring places also mattered, including whether development appeared to consider other people's access to daylight and space.

The discussion brought care into the understanding of architectural quality. It could be visible through detail, comfort and the provision made for ordinary use. A building's emotional effect was therefore connected with whether people felt that their experience had been considered.

3.5 Participation needs a connection to decisions

The afternoon explored what happens when people's knowledge enters a design process. There was interest in involving citizens early, alongside questions about

how their contributions could influence decisions within financial, professional and planning constraints.

One participant described an experience in which an apparently collaborative process did not carry through to delivery:

“A developer’s gone out of their way to do a sort of a co-design process ... but at the end of the day, having agreed a design for this complex with community people, it was just abandoned ... they just said, ‘Oh no, we can’t afford that, so we’re going to build this instead.’ So how do you control that?”

Alongside this concern, a designer described continuing engagement with residents during a housing project in Seoul. The account emphasised understanding what people wanted to preserve or change, revisiting assumptions as circumstances developed, and learning when the outcome fell short.

The conversation recognised that every individual request could not necessarily be accommodated. It nevertheless questioned the value of gathering evidence when there was no clear route for using it, and considered the importance of explaining decisions and reflecting back what had been heard.

Meaningful participation therefore involves an ongoing relationship between knowledge and action. The challenge is to make that relationship visible, especially when priorities change or constraints prevent an idea from being delivered.

3.6 The experience of development begins before completion

Participants also considered the years people spend living alongside construction. The discussion drew attention to the distance between a proposed future place and the environment residents encounter while it is being created.

One contribution framed this as a design question:

“It’s pretty interesting to look again into the meanwhile experience of places ... you’re surrounded by walls ... and there must be a place for design ... while it’s in construction development, just waiting for the final use to come.”

Construction was described through disrupted journeys, noise, dust, cranes and the visual presence of enclosed sites. These experiences could recur daily and continue over substantial periods. The prospect of a completed development did not resolve the question of what people needed in the meantime.

This extended the workshop’s discussion of human outcomes across time. People experience a neighbourhood through its transition as well as its eventual form. Attention to that transition offers another way to understand whether development acknowledges the lives already taking place around it.

04

MAKING LIVED EXPERIENCE PART OF THE EVIDENCE: A PRESENTATION BY JOSEPH COOK

Design anthropologist, UCL



The afternoon began by considering how citizens' experiences could inform the decisions that shape their surroundings. Joseph Cook, who leads IGP's Citizen Science Academy, presented citizen science as a way for communities to investigate the questions that matter to them and produce knowledge that designers and policymakers can use.

His presentation challenged the idea that gathering more data necessarily

brings us closer to understanding people. Measurements and numerical comparisons can appear authoritative while leaving important aspects of everyday experience unexplored. Citizen science offered a different starting point: working with residents who understand their communities, can build relationships and know how to ask questions in language that makes sense locally.

The distinction was about when citizens become involved and what they can influence:

“The key thing really is that it’s not ... that a policy maker or an architect has already done a thing and then they’re asking for feedback on it. It’s about engaging with citizens really, really early in the process, so they’re doing research about questions that they know are important rather than questions that others have designed.”

Joseph illustrated this approach through research outputs that people could encounter beyond a conventional report. A tea towel explored how cooking and recipes helped sustain cultural identity amid neighbourhood change. A scarf brought together multilingual research quotations and drawings associated with migrants’ experiences. These objects communicated findings while retaining something of the lives and relationships from which they had emerged.

A citizen scientist then described research into the decline of Caribbean community spaces in Newham. Alongside interviews and a focus group, the project used a local radio station to invite discussion. The response prompted a further broadcast, extending the conversation beyond the original plan. Findings were shared through a written report, animation and a comic strip, recognising that different audiences engage with information in different ways.

The example also connected cultural and social needs with economic questions. Research explored spending that took place outside the borough because suitable community spaces were unavailable locally. This showed how residents’ questions could reveal consequences relevant to organisations making decisions about an area.

Joseph emphasised the relationships needed to sustain this work. The Academy recruits through trusted local voluntary organisations, pays citizen scientists and recognises their contributions through co-authorship. These arrangements respond to the experience of being repeatedly asked for information by researchers who then disappear.

The presentation brought a further dimension to the workshop’s discussion of belonging. People’s knowledge of a place develops through living there, noticing changes and understanding what matters to others. Citizen science creates a route for that knowledge to become evidence, while keeping the people who produced it involved in the conversation.

05

THINK-PAIR-SHARE

The Think-Pair-Share exercise began with quiet reflection on prompts about materials, emotion and everyday experiences of the built environment. Participants then exchanged their observations in one-to-one conversations, exploring what made places feel comfortable, welcoming or meaningful, and where their responses differed.

The prompts asked participants to consider:

- **Materials and emotion:** “Think of a building or a street where the material itself, not the use, not the people, made you feel unwelcome or shut out. And then think of one that made you feel joyful and included. Describe what made you feel that way.”
- **The evidence pack:** “What did you read in the evidence pack we sent you that stayed with you or resonated with you?”
- **Health, mood and the built environment:** Recall stretches of a regular walk or commute where the scale, repetition, texture or light of buildings changed how the body or mood felt, rather than changes caused by traffic, weather or people.

- **Influence over decisions:** Reflect on a decision about a building, street or public space encountered after it had already been made, and identify design choices, large or small, that could have been different.

The materials prompt was shared across the room, while further questions varied by table. Notes distinguished positive experiences, difficulties and opportunities.

5.1 Materials shape the relationship between a person and a place

Materials were described through the relationship they invited people to have with their surroundings. Softness, warmth and texture could encourage someone to approach, touch or feel comfortable. Coldness and sharp edges could create distance. These reactions connected appearance with physical experience, suggesting that the quality of a place was partly understood through what it felt like to encounter it.

Preferences for wood and natural materials featured alongside appreciation of textured concrete. That combination complicated any simple distinction between welcoming natural materials and unwelcoming manufactured ones. The

way a material had been worked could change its character and the response it produced:

“I love a textured wall, or a ceiling ... they cast the concrete ... they used plastic sheets on the formwork and it looked like fabric ... I mean, it was a fancy house, but it looked nice.”

The example showed how an apparently hard material could acquire qualities associated with softness. Its appeal came through a particular treatment, rather than from concrete as a category. References to patterned tiles and weathered timber similarly brought attention to surfaces with detail, variation or traces of time.

Craftsmanship extended this relationship beyond the immediate sensory response. The time and skill involved in making models and developing building materials were connected with care and pride. The conversation suggested that recognising this investment could contribute to valuing a building and wanting it to endure.

There was also a social dimension to comfort. A remark about deep pile carpet developed into an exchange about feeling fortunate and being allowed into somewhere special. Material quality could therefore communicate something about the person's own position within a space. Pleasure was associated with the experience of being welcomed into an environment that felt cared for.

5.2 Everyday journeys reveal how pleasure and difficulty coexist

Accounts of familiar routes showed how the experience of a place could change over a short distance. An enjoyable stretch might give way to an obstacle, a crowded environment or somewhere that felt uncomfortable. These changes were often described through small features that acquired significance because they were encountered repeatedly.

One account brought together the appeal of a tree-lined street, the difficulty of its pavement and the pleasure of its illuminated windows:

“I go down a really broad street that has lots of trees, which I really like, but ... they cause the whole pavement to crack ... there's some really beautiful stained glass windows on some of the doorways ... they let off this really lovely glow, which makes me happy.”

The value of the trees and the difficulty associated with their roots existed within the same experience. This exposed a challenge in treating individual features as straightforward indicators of quality. Something that contributed to the pleasure of a street could also make movement through it less comfortable.

The stained glass offered another kind of value: a small, recurring moment of enjoyment within an ordinary journey. It did not need to be a destination or a major architectural feature to matter. Its significance lay in how it affected someone passing by.

Other accounts described discomfort on crowded trains and apprehension on dark canal towpaths. The latter drew partly on television portrayals, showing how expectations could enter an experience alongside the physical surroundings. Familiar animals and everyday recognition, meanwhile, could make a route feel more personal.

Together, these observations showed the difficulty of separating a response to buildings from the wider life around them. The prompt encouraged attention to design, but the accounts repeatedly connected surfaces and light with movement, maintenance, familiarity and encounters. The human experience of a route emerged through their interaction.

5.3 Quality matters, but people recognise it in different ways

The conversations asked what made a place desirable to occupy, rather than simply functional. Shopping centres offered a way into this question. A large indoor environment could provide shelter and services while still feel lacking in atmosphere or opportunities to enjoy spending time there.

A remembered fountain at Brent Cross illustrated how an individual feature could create an attachment lasting from childhood. Suggestions about seating, clearer wayfinding and more appealing interiors expressed a wish for places that offered reasons to stay beyond shopping or eating. The question was how a space could support a fuller experience of being there.

Residential appearance raised a related issue. One account questioned whether a development's colour scheme made it

feel like somewhere the speaker would choose to live:

“Certainly the colour scheme is not really matching to anything in its surroundings ... you want to be in a place where you want to live. It should feel like you want to be there. I don’t think that would appeal to me to live there if I had a choice.”

The response concerned both personal preference and the building's relationship with its setting. A preference for blue was expressed elsewhere in the same exchange, prompting further explanation that the objection involved the combination of colours. That distinction mattered: liking a colour was different from liking how it had been used.

This led towards a wider question about how individual reactions could inform choices intended to work for many people. The conversations made preferences more specific, but did not resolve them into a common aesthetic judgement.

They also challenged assumptions about who wanted quality. Discussion of the Olympic Park, pleasant local facilities and experiences of luxury emphasised that people across different circumstances could want attractive surroundings and things that made life enjoyable. Accessibility and affordability remained important alongside those aspirations. The challenge was to understand what people valued without reducing their expectations to what others assumed they needed.

06

BRINGING THE INSIGHTS TOGETHER

The mapping exercise brought observations onto a shared wall, grouping related ideas while retaining the Rose Bud Thorn distinction between positive experiences, difficulties and opportunities. Following a summing up by Solveiga Pakštaitė, workshop facilitator, delegates reflected on what the conversations had revealed and how that knowledge could inform future work.

These closing reflections connected the detail of everyday experience with wider questions about development. They also considered what Humanise could do to strengthen citizen involvement, moving from the concerns expressed during the day towards possibilities for change.

6.1 Everyday details reveal questions about the wider city

One reflection drew attention to the range of scales represented in the conversations. Experiences at a front door, on a commute or within a neighbourhood sat alongside questions about the city as a whole. Their significance came partly from repetition: a small feature could affect someone often enough to become a lasting part of how they understood a place.

“We move from city-wide observations through to something very small that might affect us on a daily basis. On your way into work and back, you notice something repeatedly and it leaves an indelible mark on you ... it speaks to me of the complexity of the challenge we have. It’s not just a city. It’s not just your building. It’s not just your front door. It’s everything.”

Public toilets illustrated how these scales connected. A concern about their availability led directly into questions about maintenance, safety and economics. Understanding the experience meant examining the arrangements that produced it, including who funded a facility and who took responsibility for its continuing use.

Another contribution valued the presence of funding and developer involvement within the conversation. Ideas about more human places were being considered alongside the practical conditions needed to deliver them. This gave the closing reflections a focus on how aspirations could become part of decisions, rather than remaining desirable but disconnected possibilities.

6.2 Citizen involvement needs a place at the beginning

Suggestions about future practice returned to the timing of participation. If citizens were invited after the main direction of a project had been established, responding to their knowledge could require expensive changes. Early involvement offered a greater opportunity to shape the questions and assumptions from which design began.

A comparison with user testing in advertising raised the possibility of making this involvement a required part of a project:

“Can we get a standardised approach ... when there’s briefs coming in, when we’re doing bids, that means you have to have the user participation at the very earliest stages ... there’s no point in doing it ... at stage three, and you go, ‘Wonderful ideas, but it’s going to be really expensive to go back to stage one.’ So it doesn’t happen.”

The proposal connected participation with the structure of commissioning and delivery. Including it within briefs and bids could give it a defined role, rather than depending on an individual team’s willingness to make space for it later.

A designer at Heatherwick also reflected on using the knowledge available through Humanise more fully during early research and competitions. Projects

in unfamiliar countries made this particularly relevant: an appealing design still needed an understanding of the people and context it would serve.

These contributions framed citizen involvement as part of developing the design itself, with the potential to influence what was proposed before commitments became difficult to change.

6.3 Different ways of listening can reveal different experiences

The closing discussion questioned whose views a workshop could hear. Being willing to speak in a room or place a comment on a wall did not necessarily mean that every concern would be expressed. An anonymous route was suggested for experiences people might hesitate to disclose publicly.

The radio research described earlier in the day provided a practical example:

“The same document, the same presentation you would use for a council or a funder or developer ... is not going to work for [everyone] ... I used a radio station. People phoned in. They could make up what name they wanted to be. But you’ve got all these people talking freely on the phone, which is a lot more freeing than writing something down or speaking one-on-one.”

This linked the means of contributing with trust, language and confidence. Different audiences might need different

invitations, and familiarity with the person or organisation asking could influence how openly they responded.

Schools and younger people were also proposed as an important focus. Their ideas could broaden the conversation beyond the feasibility constraints familiar to professionals. They would also live with the consequences of current development decisions over many years.

The challenge was to create opportunities that suited different people, allowing a wider range of knowledge to enter the conversation.

6.4 Existing knowledge needs to accumulate and remain visible

A further suggestion concerned what happened to citizens' experiences after they had been gathered. Familiar problems appeared across the day, raising the question of how evidence could be carried forward rather than repeatedly rediscovered.

~~~~~  
*“Could the movement be ... a platform for the voice of the citizens? ... Having heard all of the stories today, we just keep making the same mistakes ... how can [that data] be collated in a way that ... is platformed and built on?”*  
~~~~~

This proposed a continuing role for Humanise in making citizen knowledge visible and connecting it with people able to act on it. The emphasis was on preserving and building upon what had already been learned, while allowing

further experiences to extend or challenge it.

Humanise's closing response described change as a collective effort involving partners, citizen scientists and different messengers. It also acknowledged the difficulty of moving from identifying what people disliked towards understanding what they wanted.

The suggestions made during this discussion were possibilities for future work, rather than agreed commitments. Together, they outlined ways the day's learning could continue: earlier involvement, broader routes for contributing and a stronger connection between accumulated knowledge and design practice.

THANK YOU



The organisers thanked everyone who contributed their experiences, questions and ideas throughout the day. Thanks were also extended to Heatherwick Studio for hosting and the IGP team for developing the prompts and organising the workshop.

Images by Hugo Campos

METHODOLOGY

This report has been prepared by Lorefully using qualitative material captured during the event. The primary source material comprises live delegate audio recordings. These recordings were transcribed and systematically reviewed to identify recurring themes, areas of agreement, points of challenge, and unresolved tensions. The analysis reflects only the content of spoken contributions made during the sessions.

The Use of AI in This Report

Artificial Intelligence was used as a supporting analytical tool in the preparation of this summary report. Its role was limited to processing, structuring, and synthesising discussion material and did not replace human judgement, interpretation, or editorial oversight at any stage.

AI was primarily used to assist with the following activities:

- Audio Enhancement: Removing background noise and boosting speaker voices to ensure clarity of transcription.
- Transcription support: Converting recorded discussions into text to enable systematic qualitative analysis.
- Thematic organisation: Supporting the identification and grouping of recurring topics, concepts, and areas of emphasis within and across the discussions
- Comparative synthesis: Assisting in the organisation of material across multiple use cases to enable side-by-side comparison using consistent analytical lenses.
- Drafting support: Helping to structure narrative summaries and tables in a clear and consistent format, based on direction provided by the project team.

DISCLAIMER

While this report has been prepared by the Lorefully team, no attempt has been made to validate, contradict, challenge, or independently interpret the views expressed by participants beyond what is evidenced in the captured materials. The analysis reflects synthesis and structuring of the discussion content as presented, rather than judgement on accuracy, feasibility, or merit.

Lorefully's role is to use its platform to capture, organise, and present insights generated by participants. The outputs of this report are intended to support further analysis and interpretation by subject matter experts, policymakers, and decision-makers, rather than to serve as definitive conclusions or recommendations.

© 2026 Gauge19 Ltd, trading as Lorefully. All rights reserved.



The Humanise campaign is sparking a global movement calling for more joyful, engaging and human buildings and cities. Inspired by Thomas Heatherwick's book *Humanise: a maker's guide to building our world*, the campaign shines a light on how dull, soulless buildings are bad for our brains, our economy, and the planet – and how what surrounds us can shape us, connect us, and bring us joy. Because human beings need human buildings.

Find out more and join the movement at humanise.org



The Institute for Global Prosperity is redesigning prosperity for the 21st century, changing the way we conceive and run our economies, and reworking our relationship with the planet. Our vision is to build a prosperous, sustainable global future, rooted in fairness and justice, and aligned with a realistic, long-term understanding of humanity's place in the world.

Find out more at ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/global-prosperity