

P5 Reflection -

Jara Massimo Meindertsma

4849825

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

My graduation project is till certain extend heavily in line with the Urban Architecture studio believes as the project followed a very widespread scala of methods as a base for research and design. On other extends I clearly distanced the project from some more straightforward site principles and tried to envision the context in more conceptual levels and investigations of terminologies. The concept of the border came into play.

Football is rivalry. It represents places, from villages, towns, and cities to whole nations. Within these places, communities are formed and conflicts arise. The project fosters the social approach of a habitat. An Environment. Therefore tries to understand the interconnectedness of various elements within a system.

It showcases the capability of translating actions in space into physical elements on site. It makes not just an abstract notion but a physical representation of an idea. Therefore exploring the multidisciplinary character of architecture, seen as an art and a building science.

The project is constructed out of a multifaceted investigation, all linked to a very specific theme. It responds over multiple scales. From the observation of The Friche to the stadium and its neighbourhood, and from its smaller physical networks to its bigger infrastructures. Eventually spatializing all clues into the scale of the building envelope.

2. How did your research influence your design/recommendations and how did the design/recommendations influence your research?

The narrative based presentation of the P1 formed on a conceptual level a massive red line throughout the whole design and further research. The idea of time, used for the P1 model of the station, was very applicable f we talk about sequences. This, in good conversation with my Research tutor, led to the categorization of my findings in the same scope of sequence and therefore in order of time. The design and its wide spread location The Friche offered potential for this same sequence I encountered in my fieldwork and therefore a continuation of methods.

In all of my research I did not impose myself. I stood, took pictures, observed and recorded. I left it alone and didn't intervein. This is the main characteristic of the site. And wanted to maintain this, respect it, without directly solving issues. The projected intended to create a space where it can happen. Where it can happen more harmoniously without compromising the safety and without compromising the surroundings.

The project approached the site through intangible characteristics seen in the research. It managed to illustrate this in a sequence. In this narrative, sometimes we had some forms to make it the way it is, sometimes it had some events, sometimes a different chemical. So the proposed project took the same lenses and used it in order to reformulate the space not only on an urban and architectural level, as well in the landscape. The ideal, it's alive and changing.

I strategically designed this regenerative kind of landscape and then left it alone. It's going to transform with time, in the same philosophy as the research part was approached. A base was built. Considered through its functionalities, not dictating, neither controlling. Leaving it open for interpretation.

3. How do you assess the value of your way of working (your approach, your used methods, used methodology)?

What I appreciate from the project is that it really focuses on the actual user profiles and how these people interact with space. How we can learn from this and use it in further design. These interactions form an unique human thing that aren't often combined with architectural practice.

In hindsight, my way of working could have been more effective with more decisive decision making after the P2 when the transition from research to design was crucial. Additionally, extending the use of physical models for experimentation and form-finding, as done more excessive till the P2, could have led to these valuable insights in earlier stages.

4. How do you assess the academic and societal value, scope and implication of your graduation project, including ethical aspects?

The project surpasses the architectural framework and is intended to give the viewer insight to the hidden aspects of the rather present world of supporterism.

This design rejects those commercialized aesthetics in favor of a more honest, rugged expression, much like the underground football scene itself rejects the sanitized, corporatized version of football that we see in modern days. They are in favor of a more authentic experience.

As far as it rejects, it also invites. The graduation project invites the observer to join in the discourse of passion and containment in the built environment. It invites fellow designer to consider the context of the stadium ground in a deeper layered approach. One that goes beyond solely a programmatic infill. One that considers not solely 11 performers on the pitch, but the crowd as the 12th man. The idea that the game starts outside. That this pre performance is on its own turn watched as well. One that understands underlying networks that service the actual football structure. One that responds on the landscape and the surrounded built environment or vice versa. One that embraces imperfection when it's valued by the actual users.

5. How do you assess the value of the transferability of your project results?

As a true sport enthusiast, I witnessed many supporter scenes around the globe. Similar supporter behaviour is noticed, the demand comparable, the proposed problems equal. This was documented in the Atlas, which focused primarily on the supporter networks of Brussels but extended to different clubs when earlier observation reached there.

Besides, the project can be an invitation to other students and designers, not only for its results as well for its methodology. Methods of data collection within closed communities requires upfront knowledge. Where social media can be a significant source for input. Fieldwork requires a considered, cautious but upfront approach, which is like to believe can be relevant in similar context and situations.

Further considerations

Questions: Till what extend is the navigation through different timescales implemented in the project and what potential does it hold for further (interdisciplinary) research?

The project focuses primarily on the timescale through the hour/ days. We deal with a certain unpredictability in behavior. I worked with scenarios in what could be related to the different ways they act. People, garbage, urine as unpleasant for invasive species, puke as fertilizer, organic material, atmospheric actions and fire. All left behind traces leading to visible changes in the landscape. A few scenario's out of a million permutations. Supporters have in a way have more agency than the designer. But where supporters leave a trace now, nature does so later. Depended on the state the supporters inherit. Nature decides who is dominant. Which fits the concept of the observant. Each user, player, supporter or natural spicy has its own grown in different time scales. The project intended to bring all these facets together in urbanism, the landscape and architecture and the ways people are expected to interact within them through sequences of space. All tight together through one concept, as an approach that has potential but requires further research and design development to get the precision it deserves.

Material rust and spatial arrangements that give possibilities of excessive growth of vegetation are considered but could be worked out in more extensive technical and ecological manners. On a longer time scale, one could consider these regenerative and flourishing qualities besides damage and inaccessibility.

A far future takes into consideration the longevity of the stadium and therefore the surrounding built environment. As it loses its primary purpose in around 30-50 years. To tackle this relatively short lifespan, potentiality lays within the removal of certain elements. Relating to topics of demountability and therefore what's left to the site. When abandoned and left alone, the platforms disappears completely and becomes part of the landscape. It slowly transforms into a monument.

The site holds the legacy of all the games that occurred. Maintained the importance of the sports, the fans and the players. Embedded in the landscape. And discuss this in relation to the effects of a continuously ran stadium that underwent refurbishment or even complete demolishment.
