At the beginning of Unit 2, my enquiry centred on sound. I was interested in how graphic communication might translate something temporary and invisible into a visual language, beginning with drawings and a booklet that recorded different sounds through line and notation. As these experiments developed, however, I became less interested in what an individual sound might look like and more interested in what listening could reveal about the place in which that sound occurred. Layering sounds showed that they rarely existed independently; they overlapped, interrupted one another and changed according to position, attention and time. This led to *Sonic Drifting*, where listening became a method for moving through and recording place. Through walking, mapping and diagramming, I initially assumed that the route traced by the drift would become the work. Instead, I found that the line itself contained relatively little of what had made the experience meaningful. The more significant information existed around it: interruptions, repetition, atmosphere, rhythm and the particular conditions of a place at a particular moment. This shifted my inquiry from representing sound towards questioning what kinds of information about place remain outside conventional visual representation.

Dialogue around this work further unsettled my reliance on mapping. The maps could record a route, but they also flattened an embodied, temporal and changing experience into a fixed image. I therefore began to move from my own sensory encounter with place towards the less immediately visible ways in which a place acquires meaning collectively, through memory, testimony, and history. The Carlton Tavern became a way of testing these questions within one specific site. Its demolition and subsequent reconstruction in facsimile introduced a condition I had not previously considered; a place whose physical continuity had been broken, but whose appearance and use had been deliberately restored. Triangulating this work with Rachel Whiteread's *House* shifted my position again. *House* makes the absence of a demolished building physically present, while the reconstructed Carlton appears to materialise continuity. Yet I no longer understand presence and absence as simple opposites. A particularly important realisation came through considering that *House* itself no longer exists, yet continues to be encountered through photographs, writing and the publication that documents it. The book does not restore the sculpture, but gives something absent another space in which to persist.. This made me reconsider something that may have been present throughout my research; a sound disappears after it is heard, a walk ends, an atmosphere changes, a building is altered or demolished, and an artwork can cease to exist. Graphic communication cannot preserve these experiences intact, but it can give form to what remains of them, or what they were.

In this sense, my current enquiry remains deliberately open; how might graphic communication give form to the traces through which a place exists and changes over time? Moving forward, I want to test a wider framework for recording place, building on sound and collective memory while also looking at objects, material traces, visual cues, movement and the spaces between walls. Places are constantly changing, often so gradually that it is difficult to identify the moment at which one version becomes another. I am interested in recording place as something situated within a particular moment in time rather than fixed or permanent. This is where I am beginning to think about a portfolio of place; a collection of traces, fragments and observations that together give form to a place at a particular point in time. Rather than reconstructing a place as a complete whole, it could hold one version whilst acknowledging that the place itself will perpetually change.