

ARCHITECTURE IN FLUX

Kristanti Dewi Paramita

*Department of Architecture
Universitas Indonesia
Indonesia*

ARSNET, 2025, Vol. 5, No. 2, 80–85

DOI: 10.7454/arsnet/v5i2.175

ISSN 2777-0710 (online)

ISSN 2777-0702 (print)

Correspondence Address: Kristanti Dewi Paramita, Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus UI, Depok 16424, Indonesia. Email: kristanti.dewi@ui.ac.id

This edition of ARSNET explores architecture amidst the social, cultural, and environmental transformations in the current society. The notion of flux highlights such transformation, where constant change takes place and calls for profound architectural shifts. As the "sphere of multiplicity," space is always a product of social relations, and therefore it is always ambiguous and subject of negotiations (Massey, 2005, p. 95). Appreciation of fluxes manifests in how architecture celebrates a more fluid and temporary existence of space and its expression (Finke & Weltzien, 2017; Hack, 2011). The world is always in "perpetual flux" (Ingold, 2011, p. 72) and therefore architecture must continuously find a way to situate itself amidst such change. Such calls for architecture become increasingly urgent as contemporary discourse of architecture has highlighted how the change that was initially considered perpetual and constant now exists in radical, rapid, and often disruptive ways towards its society.

Architecture in the state of flux appreciates its position as something in transit, situated within the passage of time (Handa, 2014; Till, 2013). Whilst architecture tends to try its best in freezing time and capturing moments of perfection, in reality, it is always exposed to the inevitability of time and its destructive potential (Till, 2013). Such knowledge brings sobering truth towards how architecture faces brokenness and obsolescence, as well as being subjected to decay and deterioration (Blanco-Wells, 2021; Till, 2013). Architecture that signifies awareness and acceptance towards these vulnerabilities leads to alternative practices that appropriates design possibilities generated by such flux conditions. Examples are discussions about the adaptation and reuse of buildings (Brooker, 2017; Schneider & Till, 2005), or discussions about dynamic assembly and disassembly in construction (Arisya & Suryantini, 2021; Yatmo et al., 2021).

Climate change and urbanisation alter land use patterns and create fragmentation of habitat, disconnecting humans and nature (Harrison, 2012). Bridging towards such fragmentation requires alternative perspectives of understanding the boundary of architecture that enable experience and occupation of multiple living beings (Arrizabalaga, 2020; Paramita et al., 2023, 2024). Such understanding reflects different ways of understanding the materiality of living space and its configuration of thresholds. Environmental pressures, therefore, create new relations between architecture and nature, demonstrating architecture that does not aim for impermeability but instead celebrates openness (Dobraszczyk, 2023).

Fluxes of people and goods travel through space, occupying multiple terrains and creating density. Density focuses on the intensity of occupation that is important for the vitality of urban life (Jacobs, 1961). However, the rapid growth of urban development led to conditions of hyper-density, creating rapid change of social conditions that can be detrimental to well-being and liveability (Lehmann, 2016). With increasing density, however, the users may have different backgrounds and they may live in different temporalities (Allen et al., 2016). The massive developments may then lead to some crisis, such as unused or obsolete buildings. Unevenness of such developments may create urban sprawl where some parts of the urban fabric are neglected or overlooked, creating an ever-changing urban fabric that comes from the spatial negotiations of diverse users (Frenkel & Ashkenazi, 2008; Li et al., 2021). Architecture in the state of high-density, therefore, often leads to various new typologies that adapt and respond to various challenges that come with massive development of urban life.

The articles in this issue interrogate the various fluxes that shape architectural design practice. The studies explore architecture situated in the context that has undergone various shifts, from the changing environment due to various environmental pressures created by extreme weather, urbanisation or industrialisation, to the changing social and cultural practices due to technological developments and modernisation. The first article by Yenny Gunawan, Justin Coupertino Umbu, and Marianne Trautten explores how architecture can be defined based on the idea of impermanence. Using the vernacular context of the Sumbanese house, the study identifies strategies developed by local communities that enable them to respond towards deterioration and the need for alteration towards the materiality and spatiality of the house.

The next exploration identifies particular conditions of spaces that happen in flux, that are often overlooked, incomplete, or hidden from plain sight. The article by Fatiharla Imanisahda and Yandi Andri Yatmo speculates on the idea of nothingness, exploring architecture based on void operations. The study is situated in the dystopian context, where massive development has led to leftover spaces with varying quality, from the neglected, the ruin, and the underground areas. Void operations become a way to read how such a space of flux occurs interdependently with the dynamics of urban development, expanding on how nothingness can actually become the basis of active and generative elements of architecture.

Rapid environmental change deepened the separation between humans and nature. The third article by Aulia Rahman explores the existence of wetlands in Banjarmasin, a form of environment which was initially valued by the locals but is significantly altered by urban development. The study proposes the idea of non-discrete architecture to reconnect humans and the wetland environment. Through a design study of a pavilion, the article outlines how non-discrete architecture manifests through sensorial encounters that are enabled through the use

of surface orientation and materiality, emphasising the everyday experience of wetlands.

The fourth and fifth articles highlight the rapid development of the urban context and how architecture needs to adapt towards such conditions. The fourth article by Muhammad Daffa Brisbhanuharto and Novrizal Primayudha explores adaptive and inclusive seating design for transit-oriented interiors. Transit-oriented interiors create complex commercial and social micro-environments, attracting diverse user groups. Seating systems become a space that offers a moment of pause towards such complexity. Exploring the form and arrangements of these seating spaces becomes necessary to create adaptive seating possibilities for different quantities and types of visitors. The fifth article by Ajeng Regita Assyifa, Imaniar Sofia Asharhani, and Adriyan Kusuma explores the redevelopment of traditional markets using behavioural approaches. With the deterioration of market conditions and changing demography of potential visitors due to modernisation, the study reprograms the spaces based on user behaviour, creates wayfinding elements for clearer spatial cognition, and develops surfaces that shape the sensorial experience.

This edition of ARSNET reflects on the social, cultural, and environmental flux that shapes alternative discussion of architecture. It calls for attention towards how the temporality of flux creates varying qualities of space, which can become impermanent, incomplete, and disconnected. The articles in this study show how such changes call for new inquiry about how architecture can be assembled and how it can be materialised. It focuses on how architecture might manoeuvre, respond, reconnect, and even celebrate such flux-driven qualities. In doing so, this edition expands knowledge on changing processes and relationships of nature and the built environment, towards architecture that continuously evolves and mediates change.

References

- Allen, A., Lampis, A., & Swilling, M. (2016). *Untamed urbanisms* (A. Allen, A. Lampis, & M. Swilling, Eds.). Routledge.
- Arisyah, K. F., & Suryantini, R. (2021). Modularity in design for disassembly (DfD): Exploring the strategy for a better sustainable architecture. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 738(1), Article 012024. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/738/1/012024>
- Arrizabalaga, N. F. (2020). Urban interiority in the Anthropocene. *Interiority*, 3(1), 83–96. <https://doi.org/10.7454/in.v3i1.74>
- Blanco-Wells, G. (2021). Ecologies of repair: A post-human approach to other-than-human natures. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.633737>
- Brooker, G. (2017). *Adaptation strategies for interior architecture and design*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Dobraszczyk, P. (2023). *Animal architecture: Beasts, buildings and us*. Reaktion Books.
- Finke, M., & Weltzien, F. (Eds). (2017). *State of flux: Aesthetics of fluid materials*. Reimer.
- Frenkel, A., & Ashkenazi, M. (2008). Measuring urban sprawl: How can we deal with it? *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 35(1), 56–79. <https://doi.org/10.1068/b32155>

- Hack, G. (2011). Urban flux. In T. Banerjee & A. Loukaitou-Sideris (Eds.), *Companion to urban design* (pp. 446–462). Routledge.
- Handa, R. (2014). *Allure of the incomplete, imperfect, and impermanent: Designing and appreciating architecture as nature*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315735214>
- Harrison, A. L. (2012). *Architectural theories of the environment: Posthuman territory*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Ingold, T. (2011). Rethinking the animate, reanimating thought. In *Being alive* (pp. 67–75). Routledge.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. Random House.
- Lehmann, S. (2016). Sustainable urbanism: Towards a framework for quality and optimal density? *Future Cities and Environment*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40984-016-0021-3>
- Li, X., Suoerdahan, G., Shi, Z., Xing, Z., Ren, Y., & Yang, R. (2021). Spatial-temporal impacts of urban sprawl on ecosystem services: Implications for urban planning in the process of rapid urbanization. *Land*, 10(11), Article 1210. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10111210>
- Massey, D. B. (2005). *For space*. SAGE Publications.
- Paramita, K. D., Atmodiwirjo, P., & Yatmo, Y. A. (2023). Cohabitation of people and animals in vernacular settlements: Insight from Indonesian villages. *Proceedings of International Seminar on Vernacular Settlement 12 Vernacular Built Environments: Towards a Sustainable Future*.
- Paramita, K. D., Yatmo, Y. A., Atmodiwirjo, P., & Suryantini, R. (2024). Multispecies contact zones: The entangled interior grounds of domestic livestock keeping. *Interiors*, 13(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20419112.2024.2335022>
- Schneider, T., & Till, J. (2005). Flexible housing: Opportunities and limits. *Arq: Architectural Research Quarterly*, 9(2), 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1359135505000199>
- Till, J. (2013). *Architecture depends*. MIT Press.
- Yatmo, Y. A., Atmodiwirjo, P., Saginatari, D. P., & Harahap, M. M. Y. (2021). Development of modular school design as a permanent solution for post-disaster reconstruction in Indonesia. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, 12(1), 101–113. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJDRBE-10-2019-0070>

