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URBAN DESIGN

> PETER VAN DRIMMELEN
> 1956

CONSTRUCTED

> 1960-1968

NUMBERS

> 165 HECTARE
> 6,236 HOUSES
> 13,330 PEOPLE (TODAY)
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OWNERSHIP HOUSING LOMBARDIJEN

54%

CORPORATION
PRIVATE RENTAL
PRIVATE

OWNERSHIP MOLIÈREBUURT WEST

PRIVATELY OWNED HOUSING BLOCKS
PRIVATE GARDENS
COMMUNAL GARDENS BELONGING TO APARTMENT BUILDINGS
LAND OWNED BY HOUSING CORPORATION

OWNERSHIP HOUSING MOLIÈREBUURT WEST

100%
> PROBLEMS IN COLLECTIVE SPACE
PROBLEMS IN COLLECTIVE SPACE
> PRIVATELY OWNED

> NO MONEY TO DEVELOP

> BUILDINGS OFFER STABILITY IN SCALE NEXT TO THE SMALL SCALE OF THE FAMILY HOUSES

> DEMOLISH?
> PROBLEMS IN CONTEXT

- safety issues
- no clear responsibilities
- lack of use collective space
- bad accessibility
- no individual value expression
- bad spatial quality

> DESIGN

> APPROACH
> PROBLEMS IN CONTEXT

- safety issues
- no clear responsibilities
- lack of use collective space
- bad accessibility
- no individual value expression
- bad spatial quality

> GENERIC SOLUTIONS

1: IMPROVING COLLECTIVE

2: IMPROVING INDIVIDUAL

> DESIGN IN CONTEXT

DESIGN 1

DESIGN 2

> APPROACH
> PROBLEMS IN CONTEXT

- Safety issues
- No clear responsibilities
- Lack of use collective space

- Bad accessibility
- No individual value expression
- Bad spatial quality

> GENERIC SOLUTIONS

1: Improving collective

- Safety
- Responsibility
- Use
- Accessibility
- Expression
- Spatial quality

2: Improving individual

- Safety
- Responsibility
- Use
- Accessibility
- Expression
- Spatial quality

> DESIGN IN CONTEXT

- Design 1
- Design 2

> EVALUATION

- Social
- Functional
- Architectural

> APPROACH
> 1. IMPROVE COLLECTIVE
> 2. IMPROVE INDIVIDUAL

> TWO LOCATIONS
1.1 MAKE READABLE TERRITORIES
1.2 INVOLVE FAMILY HOUSES IN THE TERRITORY
1.3 MOVE PARKING SPACES INTO THE TERRITORY
1.4 MAKE A COMMUNITY DECK ABOVE PARKING
1.5 MOVE ENTRANCES TO THE INSIDE
1.6 CREATE NEW STAIRCASES
1.7 CREATE A BUFFER ZONE BETWEEN PORCH AND APARTMENT
1.8 CREATE A COMMUNITY BUILDING
EXPERIMENT 1; SITUATION
EXPERIMENT 1; COMMUNITY DECK
INFLUENCE ON INDIVIDUAL SPACE

SOCIAL
- safety
- responsibility

FUNCTIONAL
- use
- accessibility

ARCHITECTURAL
- expression
- spatial quality

INFLUENCE ON COLLECTIVE SPACE

> EXPERIMENT 1; EVALUATION
2.1 MERGE APARTMENTS
2.2 ADD PRIVATE OUTSIDE SPACES
2.3 FILL THE COLLECTIVE GARDEN WITH HOUSING
2.4.1 OWNERS CHOOSE OWN WINDOW FRAMES
2.4.2 OPEN PARTS FACADES FILLED BY OWNERS
2.4.3 OWNERS CHOOSE THEIR FENCES
2.4.4 APPLY CHANGEABLE FACADE MATERIALS
2.4.5 DESIGN “SHOPPING WINDOWS”
EXPERIMENT 2; FACADE DESIGN
EXPERIMENT 2; FACADE FRAMEWORK
EXPERIMENT 2; FACADE FRAMEWORK

- Insulating Glass
- Prefabricated Concrete Frame
- Prefabricated Insulation Frame
- Schüco AWS 65 MC
- Varnished Multiplex
- Pressure Proof Insulation
- Anchorage
- Plaster Board 12.5 mm
- DAMP-PROOF COURSE
- Metal Stud
- Expansion Joint
- Existing Inner Wall
- Existing Inner Wall Insulation
- Existing Masonry
- Plaster Board 18 mm
- Wood Fiber Board 10 mm
- Existing Finish Floor
- Existing System Floor
- Adjustable Steel Anchorage
- Existing Concrete Console
- Lead Covering
- Sealing
- Steel Anchorage
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> EXPERIMENT 2; FACADE FRAMEWORK
INFLUENCE ON
INDIVIDUAL SPACE

INFLUENCE ON
COLLECTIVE SPACE

SOCIAL

FUNCTIONAL

ARCHITECTURAL

safety
responsibility

use
accessibility

expression
spatial quality

> EXPERIMENT 2; EVALUATION
INFLUENCE ON INDIVIDUAL SPACE

INFLUENCE ON COLLECTIVE SPACE

EXPERIMENT 1

EXPERIMENT 2

> COMPARISON
> IMPROVING COLLECTIVE HAS MOST POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON BOTH COLLECTIVE AND INDIVIDUAL SPACE

> IMPROVING INDIVIDUAL HAS A GOOD INFLUENCE ON THE INDIVIDUAL ARCHITECTURE BUT CAN GIVE PROBLEMS IN THE COLLECTIVE SPACE

> A COMBINATION OF COLLECTIVE AND INDIVIDUAL SOLUTIONS IS OPTIMAL
1.1 Make readable territories

**Problem**

It is not clear who owns the collective space, which has led to a lack of responsibility and a neglect of maintenance, giving a negative influence on the safety of the neighborhood.

**Goal**

Make a clear and readable division in ownership. Add a sense of belonging, responsibility, and safety.

**Principle**

This solution is a way to reuse the idea of having clear different scale levels as described in De Wijkgedachte. By better defining these territories on different scales and by making them readable for both inhabitants and visitors, the problems with ownership and responsibility of the collective space can be solved.

**Solution**

By using different materializations and buffer zones, the territories have been set. No big fences have been used, but strangers will not likely feel invited to enter the territory.

**Concessions/Weaknesses in Context**

- There is a loss of public space. Passers do not enter the territory anymore, only inhabitants and visitors.
- A bigger, more complex and active collective of owners is needed to ensure the maintenance of different territories on different scale levels.

**Evaluations**

- **Social**
  - Safety: +
  - Responsibility: +
- **Functional**
  - Use: 0
  - Accessibility: +
- **Architectural**
  - Expression: 0
  - Spatial quality: +

**Recommendations**

- A new way of organizing a collective of owners is required. This collective of owners is not only responsible for the porch or building but also its shared collective territory. Just like the different scale levels in geography, the collective of owners should have different levels of scale; the porch, the building, the ensemble of buildings and maybe even a collection of ensembles or the whole neighborhood.
1960; COLLECTIVE FORCED UPON INDIVIDUAL
1960; COLLECTIVE FORCED UPON INDIVIDUAL

2012; COLLECTIVE COLORED BY INDIVIDUAL