GRADUATION DESIGN P5

Design for a design center in Rotterdam

Hui Jun Chang b1140558
Susanne Komossa
Architecture & Modernity
Nicola Marzott
Public Realm
Jelke Fokkinga
24 June 2008
Louis Lousberg
CONTENT

| INTRODUCTION & ANALYSIS
    | Rotterdam location
    | masterplan theory
    | theme designcenter

| BUILDING
    | location
    | composition functions
    | design brief route through the building

| BUILDING SYSTEMS
    | construction
    | climate system
    | fire security

| CONCEPT
    | envelope vs inner spaces
INTRODUCTION – ROTTERDAM

Rotterdam fireborder lit on 14 mei 2007
INTRODUCTION – ROTTERDAM

Contrasts on the fireborder
INTRODUCTION — ROTTERDAM

Contrasts on the fireborder
INTRODUCTION – LOCATION

Location Delftsestraat
INTRODUCTION – LOCATION

Location pictures 5-9-2007 made by Hui Jun Chang
INTRODUCTION – LOCATION

Location pictures 5-9-2007 made by Hui Jun Chang
ANALYSIS

PROBLEM: Large amount of low education citizens
Location is known as unsafe and uncomfortable area to stay in

Video interview of the users of the Delftsestraat 5-10-2007

- I pass this street a lot, especially at night. It’s not very nice. I work at the espresso bar.
- I think “Hollywood” should leave. And there should be a different club instead.
- This area has been nominated for demolition 30 years ago already.
- I would have liked shoes here.
ANALYSIS

GOAL: Attach high education citizens

RESEARCH: Creative industry will be the most successful approach to stimulate the economy in Rotterdam*

ANALYSIS

Links between institutions and creative industry
ANALYSIS – MASTERPLAN

Maquettes of the masterplan Delftsestraat
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Masterplan Delftsestraat made by Gerard Heerink
ANALYSIS – THEORY

GOAL: To design a public building in the Delftsestraat in Rotterdam, which stimulates the public realm on the location.

QUESTION: What is public realm?

PROBLEMSTATEMENT: What kind of attitude should one person adopt itself to stimulate the public realm?
ANALYSIS – THEORY

R. SENNETT:
‘Public realm is considered as places where exchange between several social take place and indeed really takes

M. HAJER & A. REIJNDORP:
‘Public realm does not appear in formal characteristics, but in the overlap exchange between several social

‘Public domain-experiences are related with entering parochial domain of

H. CHANG:
‘Public realm is where different social people intervene and where exchange This exchange could but also just by

THEME: BALANCE IN CONTRASTS
ANALYSIS – THEME

Different parochial domains
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Different parochial domains
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Observing 'others', Beijing 17-07-2006 made by Hui Jun Chang
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Observing ‘others’, Beijing 17-07-2006 made by Hui Jun Chang
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Self reflection, Beijing 18-07-2006 made by Anne Meiborg
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Self reflection, Beijing 18-07-2006 made by Anne Meiborg
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Self reflection, Beijing 18-07-2006 made by Anne Meiborg
ANALYSIS – Designcenter

Schiecentrale in Rotterdam
Possible users of the designcenter
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Public functions

Semi public functions
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Café/ bar
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Restaurant
Café/ bar
Lounge/ karaokébar
Exhibitions/ open ateliers
Exhibitions/ lectureroom

Design shops/ showrooms
Design studio’s/ offices
Production workplaces
## BUILDING DESIGN BRIEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Min. dimensions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dimension (m²)</td>
<td>surface (m²)</td>
<td>height (m)</td>
<td>netto</td>
<td>bruto</td>
<td>netto</td>
<td>bruto</td>
<td>netto</td>
<td>bruto</td>
<td>netto</td>
<td>bruto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillage for saw &amp; sanding machines</td>
<td>7.2 x 19.2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workstation for vacuum moisture / between / air removal machines</td>
<td>7.2 x 14.4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workstation for 3d-printing / milling machines</td>
<td>7.2 x 7.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design studio with 5 workstations</td>
<td>1.8 x 1.8</td>
<td>5 x 12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery + storage for production</td>
<td>1.8 x 1.8</td>
<td>20 x 12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices with 20 workstations</td>
<td>1.8 x 1.8</td>
<td>20 x 12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting rooms for max 20 people</td>
<td>1.8 x 1.8</td>
<td>20 x 2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom</td>
<td>1.8 x 1.8</td>
<td>5% of offices</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 x 6.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery + storage for restaurant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20% of kitchen</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workrooms for every level each (16)</td>
<td>1.8 x 1.8</td>
<td>6 x 5% of level</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design studio</td>
<td>1.8 x 1.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toppers with each per 15 people (2)</td>
<td>0.9 x 1.2</td>
<td>12 x 1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(124)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toppers with each per 15 people (4)</td>
<td>0.9 x 1.2</td>
<td>4 x 7.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105 x 1.35</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall / Meeting / Exhibition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storeroom exhibition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20% of exhibition</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium for 100-200 people</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storeroom exhibition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20% of auditorium</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showroom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>7.2 x 7.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe/takeout for 100 people</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 x 1.35</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen (office + beverages + storage)</td>
<td>1.8 x 0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar/lounge</td>
<td>10.4 x 6.6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total netto</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>2096.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>2096.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2382.1</td>
<td>4735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total bruto (netto + 40%)</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>2096.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>2096.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2382.1</td>
<td>4735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Diagram of a soccer field with dimensions and a diagram of a building layout]
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THE END
Contrasting Rotterdam

Princess Maxima recently pronounced in public that the Dutch identity does not exist, like the Argentinean identity does not exist; thus I think that there is no Rotterdam identity. What is public realm all about, what do you have to deal with if you talk about public realm. Hereafter I will describe how I interpret these theories. How can I use this interpretation for a possible strategy for designing a public building in the Delftsestraat in Rotterdam.

The development of a lively urban public space must not only be approached in terms of planning or urban development. The public space is a component of the social territory and has for this reason a socio-cultural and political dimension. This theory comes forward in the work of Richard Sennett. In The fall of public man he analyses the fall of the public realm in the society. The public realm is considered as places where exchange between several social groups can take place and indeed really takes place. R. Sennett puts the public realm in relation against the private world of the family. He describes how the public realm (and the ‘civilized’ life) the last century has lost its importance in relation with the ‘intimate environment’ of the family. In former days the characteristic and what was fascinating about a city was its enormous diversity of lifestyles and activities, which randomly took place. Characterizing for (bourgeois) citizens was, according to R. Sennett that they recognized the value of this public realm. The life outside the house was considered as ‘urban experience’. In this public realm the individual also behaved differently than inside the house. In the domestic sphere intimacy stood central, but on the street the citizen was a code of civilization. This was a code that every individual showed respect and dignity of respect for other citizens. With this everyone recognized the importance of a common public realm in the city and the citizen showed their involvement to this realm. The importance of this analysis lies in the way of defining the two essentially different realms where someone also behaved differently. R. Sennett shows how the codes belonging to the city as ‘civitas’ have slowly disappeared. R. Sennett observes that the public spaces approached by designers are mainly as a system of transport canals between buildings. And that while R. Sennett thinks that ‘the nature or a public square (...) is to intermix persons and divers activities’. According to Maarten Hajer and Arnold Reijndorp in In search of new public realm the nature of public realm does not appear in formal characteristics, but in the overlap of need and exchange between several social worlds, following the idea of S. Zukin. According to her new spatial ordination is described as a collection of ‘landscapes’ that form a domain of several social sectors, interests or groups. The idea of a purely and a place bounded public realm where all groups from the society use, must be released. M. Hajer and A. Reijndorp observe that our public domain-experiences are related with entering parochial domain of ‘others’. In those cases there is on one hand the dominance of ‘others’, on the other hand the possibility to choose in what extent someone should go along. The public realm is then about the experience of cultural mobility: to have the possibility to see matters differently, the presentation of new perspectives, the confrontation with our own used patterns.

The relation between form and meaning has become diluted by the increase of mobility and the rise of a mass culture. The use of space ‘à la carte’, the selective and by life style different consumption of places, has changed the meaning and the nature of the public space. Moreover, the wishes of citizens to gain more ‘interesting’ experiences have increased. This ensures that producers must always renew their ‘formula’. The consumption of space in the urban realm aims for the massive multitude on ‘events’ and positive places, and on the other hand for the massive avoidance of all kinds of negative aspects of social development. This leads for a large amount of people to a whole other perception of places where meanings are not certain in advance.

Theories

The forming of a public space according to the typology of the early-modern city satisfies no longer, to secure and expand the public field. This is for a number of reasons. One of the reasons is that the clear typology of public space in modern town planning has become diluted. The public disappeared in a system of collective spaces. Manuel Solá-Morales explains these collective spaces in Public and collective space as places where everyday life takes place, presents itself and is present as a memory. Places where the public property and management effort are combined with private initiatives and activities of the users. He calls a shopping centre or a pasture shop, an amusement park or a stadium, a large parking lot or a shop gallery the evocative places in everyday living, the collective spaces of this time.

The battle between thinking in terms of ‘space’ and thinking in terms of ‘place’ has deep philosophical roots. Space is presented as empty and can thus be classified in simple rational entities. Places are not empty and cannot be rationally filled.
Places have been for example related with concrete events (that actually have been taken place), with myths, with history and memories. According to Marc Augé there are also ‘non-places’. M. Augé problemized the rise of quasi-mechanical passage spaces such as highways, road restaurants, TGV-stations and shopping malls and set these places against the ‘anthropological’ places that have been embedded socially and historically. Compared with the qualities of the nineteenth century station, with its whereabouts such as waiting rooms and restaurants, the modern airport is anonymous, not aimed at the individuality of the traveler but at processing massive flows of ‘passengers’. These ‘non-places’ are dominated by the transit character (where people does not stay, but at the most spends its time in) and for this reason, it in fact contradict the idea of place. In short, places characterized by identity, social relations and history, whereas ‘non-places’ have no identity and hardly indicate as historically or socially. These artificial experiences substitute historical, social and cultural meanings. This banishment leads automatically to excluding certain use and behaviour and finally to that of certain groups. These places where diversity of public are brought together, are at this moment very consciously designed as ‘zero friction’ surroundings, as friction free space. The design is dominated by the avoidance of friction. Non-places as places where no public realm is realized because of the implicit culture of functionalization. But it does not have to be like that; it is possible to have it differently. The airport Schiphol presents itself as an ‘airport-city’. But behind this facade a combination of shopping, leisure and travel goes under it. The idea of changing the perspective can lead to other qualities.

Own interpretation

For me after reading The Fall of the public man of R. Sennett has especially come clear, how the citizen tried to adapt to the changes of the society. The industrial revolution and the capitalist system brought changes with it in behaviour standards in the public and private realm. These behaviour standards were not equal to each other in both realms. In my opinion one tried to find ways how to behave in these both realms, resulting in a balance between these behaviours. An example of this was by means of clothing. After the industrial revolution, it was appropriate to express everybody’s true feelings, their real identity only in private surroundings. It was appropriate (especially for women) always to behave polite and decent in the public realm. Because of this they could hardly bring their true identity in the public realm into expression. So they cared extra attention to their clothing. By introducing specific details in their clothing, strangers could never tell how this person was really like without breaking the behaviour standards.

In my opinion even now in this modern time people try to create a balance in their behaviour in public and private realm. The title The Fall of public man suggests that the public life of the citizens will come to an end. I do not think that it will come up to that point. When we look at the history, I do not think that there is another event that has had a bigger impact on our society than the industrial revolution. In R. Sennett’s book it looks like that the public life of people has become less intensive, but it still continued and went on. Even in that period people had found a way to maintain a public life. Thereby I think that in spite of the many electro technical and telemetrical changes it is still possible to maintain a public life.

Nowadays the way to express us in the public field has been formulated by M. Hajer and A. Reijndorp in In search of new public realms. The public realm is no longer seen, like R. Sennett, as places where exchange between several social groups can take place and indeed really takes place. The public realm is now considered as places where several ‘landscapes’ overlap or touch each other. Our behaviour is no longer dominated by physical exchanging knowledge or something else, a kind of interaction between people. Our behaviour now has been related with entering parochial fields of ‘others’. We are more observing other people’s behaviour then conversing with ‘others’. From this observation we can make comparisons with ourselves and in this way we can reflect on ourselves.

Another striking difference between the previous two conceptions of R. Sennett and M. Hajer is that in the beginning of 20th century people had common public interests in public life. Even as there were several social classes, there was a general view how people should behave themselves in the public and private realm. There was, however, a difference between the behaviour of women and men, but the code of conduct had been commonly known by everyone. Nowadays this code differs not only for men and women, but also for every social group, also titled as a parish. Instead of common public interests, now parochial interests have been linked to a social group.

The importance of the public and private realm, the differences and similarities between them, the separation of both realms are already century’s long much-discussed subject in the history of architecture theory. According to M. de Solá-Morales it is important not only to aim the attention to the real public spaces of the city. This leads according to him to ignoring the development of further all kinds of collective used spaces. He puts the possibility of the urbanization of private fields, of incorporating private in the environment of public. Simply the fact that something is not entirely public, it does not mean it is not public realm at all. This could also apply for what M. Augé means with non-places. They are spaces that are in strict sense not public, but are experienced by a large amount of people as important public spaces. Because of this these spaces can be also called as public realm.

The change of public interests in the public realm to parochial interests, results in a change in the conception concerning public, private and collective spaces. Because of many different parochial interests, there are not only public and private spaces, but also collective spaces. In public spaces all different types of interests can be represented, because of the accessibility for everybody. By the arrival of parochial interests there are also collective spaces. In these spaces interests of a dominant parish have priority and there is a restricted accessibility for other parishes. It resulted in different behaviours in different spaces. In public spaces such as a traditional market hall, public interests were connected and were commonly known to everybody. That means that in these spaces everyone behaved on a quite equal manner. To be able to express their individuality, everyone behaved in their own subtle way differently. That is a whole other way then in collective spaces, such as commercial galleries. Here a person comes in a space where the interests of a parish have primacy. The interests and the code of conduct between the parish and an individual will be different then. An individual does not have to express its own, because its code of conduct is already differently than the dominant group. However, the person will compare itself with this dominant group. It is then to decide till what extend someone should go along with.

When we look at the interests in non-places, then these spaces form a separate group. In these spaces there are no connections with public interests of users or parochial interests of a dominant group users. These spaces are too briefly used, so that no interests are formed. Non-places are not spaces to stay, but to pass through. However, strict rules have been connected to these spaces. Rules that ensure zero-frictions between passers. Rules that are not established by the users, but by the administrators and stipulate the accessibility of these spaces.

In my opinion these different spaces are of great importance to people, but they are all of equal importance. There is a public realm, when there is a private realm to compare with. We can only say about something, when it is comparable with something else. Contrasts in general are necessary. This makes an ongoing movement possible. When there are no contrasts, when there is only a private realm, it will not be possible for people to express themselves differently then in this realm. Everything will become and remain as the same. As soon as contrasts exist, people can adapt their selves to one or another. Because of this people get the possibility to compare the contrasts and their behaviour in these different realms. By contrasts there is reflection on the behaviour of people.

The visual picture that I have concerning how these different fields, contrasts, spaces relate to each other is how different oils relate with another in a fluctuating jar. There is a balance
between the different spaces. Sometimes they together form something new, perhaps a collective space. Sometimes there is more of one then the other. Sometimes they remain always separated, but they always touch each other. Perhaps this picture is not correct and there is a truth that has not yet been discovered, but what is important to me, is that people need contrasts and that these contrasts are in balance.

**Topic balance in contrasts**

My topic for designing a public building at the Delftsestraat in Rotterdam is thus ‘balance in contrasts’. There are several contrasting topics to find in architecture, such as open/closed, high/small, old/new, slow/fast etc. These contrasts are also to be found in Rotterdam and even on the location in the Delftsestraat. A few examples: contrasts originated from the morphological development of Rotterdam, with the result that Rotterdam annexed the surrounding areas as a patchwork. Because of this there are contrasts between building typologies and populations between several town areas in Rotterdam. Contrasts as a result of the bombardment in the Second World War. This bombardment was the reason to rebuild a new town center, causing contrasts between building typologies, infrastructure and populations outside and inside the fire border. Thus there is a big contrast between the south and north area of the central station area, where the Delftsestraat is. Contrasts originated from top-down-planning of urban renewal projects, causing contrasts arise between building typologies within the fire limit.

An example of this urban renewal project is the Weena. This high-rise area changed the old building block located at the Delftsestraat from an area with fronts to an area with backs. This new high-rise area also caused a big difference in speed of the traffic. The Delftsestraat has been cut off from the fast movement. Now only slow traffic is present in this street, whereas in the Weena mainly fast movement is present. These contrasts ensure interactions with each other. In my opinion these contrasts also ensure the specific character of Rotterdam. This character makes Rotterdam even unique. This character must therefore be approached in the design. These contrasts originated from the history of Rotterdam, make the occupants of the building possible to be aware of this history. The possibility to identify with the city and to feel as a real citizen of Rotterdam.

But there is more to it. Such as earlier described, the society changes by the years. By means of these changes people adapt their behaviour to it. For this reason it is also important that the public building changes according the changes in the society. For me it means not only being informed of the newest developments, but especially innovation. By means of innovation, to search for new aspects, progress exists. Sometimes it means reinventing aspects that have gone lost in the previous centuries, but sometimes we must step back to come forward two steps. During the design process it is possible for example to look at innovative materialization, technique, form, function etc. But also towards different spaces that are specifically designed for that one specific program, target group and associated with a certain time, causing contrasts between several spaces. Just like what happened and still is going on in Rotterdam. The development of districts separately from each other with a specific program, target group and adapted to a certain period.

A specific development that must be taken into account in the design project is the arrival of the new central station near the Delftsestraat. This development brings with it a more international character and an increase of travelers because of the improved accessibility. Perhaps even an economic growth in the middleclass of Rotterdam.

The balance between these contrasts can be sought by bringing one aspect in the design which links all contrasts with each other. Such as repetition, color, materialization, routing etc. Aimed more specifically at the location this balance can be sought between different building typologies, by for example creating balance on the street. The street forms the passage way between different buildings. This balance could be the same types of run-up routes or entries, speed of movements, materializations on the street etc. This balance could even be continued in the building. I hope hereby to design a contrasting, but also an in balance public building.