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P2 Presentation
Observations

South Chicago

Mono-identity (homogeneity)
Financial and social hardship
Abandonment: vacant plots
Urban fabric: patchwork
Poor neighborhood amenities
Culture is religion only?

Site

Tabula Rasa
Industrial history
Ore walls
Potentially well connected to the city
From **four hundred** to **four** fragments...

- 250 x 250 meters
- Mutual diversity
- Densities as urban rules
- Defined program
... to one fragment

Close to the existing neighborhood
On urban growth line
Next to Lake Shore Drive
45 ‘fragments’
Average FAR of 1.3
Variety of road hierarchies
Fragment structure

Fragment lines
Greenery
Built environment
Street scape
Master plan derivations

Park diversity
- Public park
- Forest
- Leisure

Program
- Dwelling
- Cultural incubator
- Community building
- Retail

Density (FAR)
- 0.16 - 0.34
- 0.35 - 0.67
- 0.68 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 1.34
- 1.35 - 1.67
- 1.68 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 2.34
- 2.35 - 2.67
- 2.67 - 3.00

Plot sizes (m²)
Visualization of the density per plot
Floor area per function

- **Dwelling**: 32.078 m²
- **Cultural incubator**: 6.774 m²
  - Culture center: 4.074 m²
  - Music venue: 2.700 m²
- **Community building**: 2.225 m²
  - Fire station: 2.225 m²
- **Retail**: 8.718 m²

**Total**: 49.795 m²
Growth of the fragment

Linear growth

Cellular growth

Main growth line and incubator

Slowly on the main axis....

and around the incubator...

plots start to develop
Focus of the project

Culture center: 4.074 m²
Culture supporting dwelling units: 1.062 m²
## Why these functions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural center</th>
<th>Supportive dwelling units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cultural diversity and possibilities in current amenities</td>
<td>Combined with the cultural center, dwellings supporting their activities can improve professionality and can provide the possibility for long term engagement with the projects of people living far away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural activities are able to break socio-economic, ethnic or age barriers</td>
<td>Close proximity users will ensure a relative constant vibrancy and control of the building(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current community centers or other social neighborhood efforts deserve to be taken serious in the new plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new plan will be the stage for any art project, giving (new) locals the reason and opportunity for reflection and relativation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do I see this program function?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural center</th>
<th>Supportive dwelling units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned building that is available for art projects on any scale</td>
<td>Small scale units, owned by cultural initiators or organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A theater, rehearsal rooms, studios, meeting rooms and recording studios could be examples of how I envision this kind of building</td>
<td>Either self sustaining or clustered in small ‘living communities’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rentable by anyone interested in having a temporary or semi-permanent base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban patchwork and abandonment
Urban patchwork and abandonment

**Flexibility** (adjust to shrinking and growth) through strategic **abandonment** and (building) technology

Continuing **downscaling** of the patchwork into the building: strategic abandonment
Exploring the potential of programmatical AND physical shrinking or growth
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