

# Graduation Plan

Master of Science Architecture, Urbanism & Building Sciences



## Graduation Plan: All tracks

Submit your Graduation Plan to the Board of Examiners ([Examencommissie-BK@tudelft.nl](mailto:Examencommissie-BK@tudelft.nl)), Mentors and Delegate of the Board of Examiners one week before P2 at the latest.

The graduation plan consists of at least the following data/segments:

Personal information	
Name	Timo van Dalen
Student number	

Studio		
Name / Theme	Public Building Graduation Studio	
Main mentor	Paul Kuitenbrouwer	Project Design
Second mentor	Ger Warries	Theory and Deliniation
Third mentor	Sang Lee	
Argumentation of choice of the studio	I chose the studio partly because of my interest in the site and my preference to work on a public building for my graduation as this allows me to deal with a multi-functional building in relation to its urban context.	

Graduation project	
Title of the graduation project	<b>Connecting Friedrichshain</b>
Goal	
Location:	Friedrichshain, border between Andreasviertel and Wriezener Bahnhof
The posed problem, research questions and design assignment in which these result.	See bigger box beneath
	See bigger box beneath
	See bigger box beneath
<p><b>Problems:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. By visiting the area and talking to residents, I noticed a disconnect between peoples. People didn't really know their neighbours and some were disturbed by the many homeless and alcoholics on the streets, especially those with kids.</li> <li>2. I noticed there is loads of 'green space', yet it is of very low quality. It could more be seen as a leftover in between space with greenery rather than functional green spaces such as parks.</li> <li>3. A third issue, somewhat related to the first, is the social gap between the homeless and the non-homeless on the streets of Friedrichshain. This issue is present throughout the city, but very much so in Friedrichshain. As various homeless people sometimes build big tents on the streets and in parks, they territorialise 'their' space and become further distanced from the non-</li> </ol>	

homeless. It would be better if both groups could be brought closer together and be seen as part of the neighbourhood.

4. Fourthly, it is seen that people with a history of addiction, homelessness or other social issues, have difficulties re-entering, so to speak, society. As I found out by interviewing day care centres in Rotterdam, people with a history of social issues find themselves unemployed whilst lacking a sense of belonging, responsibility, determinacy and motivation to, let's say, work from 9-5. One of the issues here is the missing help for integration in society. Basically help people to get their lives (back) on track.

It appears to me that an architecture, urban design, or platform that allows for people to connect is missing. As social issues such as poverty, unemployment, addiction, or homelessness are vastly bigger than the scope of this project, the project aims not to make these issues to go away. However, perhaps through an architectural/urban intervention, the social gap between the people of Friedrichshain could be decreased, and therefore pay a positive social contribution to Friedrichshain.

**Site:**

The site chosen for this project is 450m long and around 50-70m wide stretching park. It follows the Straße der Pariser Kommune from the back entrance of Ostbahnhof until the intersection dividing all three neighbourhoods, Andreasviertel, Weberwiese and Wriezener Bahnhof.

Even though the site is filled with trees and has pedestrian path with some benches, it is a poorly decorated site, making it a low-quality space with a backdrop of plattenbau architecture at the heart of the neighbourhood.

**Research Questions:**

1. How can an architectural/ urban intervention allow people to be brought together and get connected so that a better sense of 'a community' can be formed?
2. Questions relating the low quality 'green space':
  - 2.1. What if existing low quality green spaces are transformed/ redesigned to become richer and more diverse?
  - 2.2. What if these spaces could function as high valued parks and public spaces at the heart of the neighbourhood?
3. How can the gap between the homeless and the non-homeless be bridged?
4. How can people with social histories of addiction, homelessness, etc. regain their sense of belonging and have a platform to help entering society?
5. What program/ system could help tackle the various social issues in Friedrichshain and allow for connections?

**Design assignment:**

In order to get people together and connect, the programmatic functions have to attract people from all / multiple backgrounds. With that, the architectural intervention has to be positioned in such a way that people will make use of the architecture, the space it creates and its functions.

This means that the access road of the building from the station side should be easily accessible and open to give access to the more public functions of the building. From the neighbourhood side, the building should be equally inviting whilst also providing privacy so that the building can deal with the various social issues of its users and form connections in a safe, undisturbed manner.

The design of the park as part of the urban intervention should be a pedestrian access road to the building and also provide various spaces of, for example, rest, joy, exercise and culture. In other words, it should cater a wide array of needs a person might come to a park for whilst relating to the community centre.

**Process****Method description**

The method I use partly consist of field research for the element of social issues. By visiting and talking to people at various places in Rotterdam such as workshops in which people can learn different crafts or places of shelter for homeless people so that I have an idea of what process people go through to reintegrate in society.

On top of that, theory on the topic of in-between space, connection and communing, will be used to get a more elaborate idea on how this can be achieved.

Subsequently, as the studio is based around research by design, this method will be used to enhance and build up the design itself.

## Literature and general practical preference

- Christian Borch, Martin Kornberger, *Urban Commons. Rethinking the City* (London: Routledge, 2015).
- Urban Think Tank, *Torre David. Informal Vertical Communities* (Zurich: Lars Müller Publishers, 2012).
- Stavros Stavrides, *Common Space. The City as Commons* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016).
- Pier Vittorio Aureli. *Rituals and Walls. The Architecture of Sacred Space* (London: AA Publishing, 2016).
- Herman Hertzberger. *Lessons for Students in Architecture*. (Nijmegen: 010 Publishers, 2005).
- The Museum of Modern Art, New York. *Small Scale, Big Change: New Architectures of Social Engagement*. (New York, The Museum of Modern Art, 2010)

## Reference Projects/ Precedents:

- Kunsthal Rotterdam (OMA)
- Apolloscholen (Herman Hertzberger)
- Neue National Galerie (Mies van der Rohe)

## Reflection

1. What is the relation between your graduation (project) topic, the studio topic (if applicable), your master track (A,U,BT,LA,MBE), and your master programme (MSc AUBS)?

The project sees the studio concept of urban commoning (or an urban commons as being a place) as a way to allow for interaction and thus create connection between peoples. So the urban common is the place, the architecture in that sense, providing the platform for interaction to take place

2. What is the relevance of your graduation work in the larger social, professional and scientific framework.

The idea is for this building to become an archetype and therefor it might present a way to create a more inclusive neighbourhood through architectural intervention.