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Choices, work, focus

First of all I would like to conclude that the project is based on a research studio which in my honest opinion is a flawed type of studio, because the requirements are the same as a regular studio, only the time that is scheduled for research is much longer therefore there is little time for a proper building in the selected time period of one academic year. Besides this, there is the own choice of program, no requirement on the building type or location, which give freedom but lacks constraints. This generates questions along the way that require more research and less assuming, but there is no time for that unless you extend your graduation period. This is also the reason why I think and agree with the teachers that the project is not yet as far as it should be and as integrated as it should be.

The reflection period has been a period of change, rethinking and consideration. There is a moment of choice, whether or not agreeing to the comments at P4, and the choice to change or stand for what the project is. For me this realisation would have been better before the P4, but there was no time that would allow for that so I continued a somewhat chaotic flawed design and searched for solutions within the design, where there should be looked for other points of view and solutions in the core of the design assignment. This resulted in a compromised design that had the possibility to be great, but lacked the fundamentals to be.

So after P4, I found myself in the position to still search for the opportunities in the design and assess them according to the project assignment and try with a simple but overcomming design gesture to create a building that is better more simple and SMART. This has resulted in a spatial design for the lower floor but due to the fact the building is more or less two buildings in one the gesture was limited to the lower floor. This final remark has also been a problem during the design period, two buildings is just to much to really grasp so I focussed on one part, but that only raises questions on the other part. So at some point I had the feeling I am on 80% on one part of the building and on 60% on the other part, but had to present a 95% total building and that has led to the design difficulties and problems that occured at P4.

As a final part of this reflection I would like to point out the role of the teachers. As a student we started with two teachers until P2. They asses architectural research and design until that point. After P2 one teacher leaves and we get a new teacher that is focussed on Building Technology and 4 consults with an Expert on Structural Design sustainability and climate design. All very valuable, but, for me as a student I would have preferred this consults as well voor building technology and spread out over these three fields of expertise. Than we would have had two teachers for architectural design (both 1/2 of the time) and three consultants to use in order to integrate the design better with technology. For me that would have been more usefull, and I think it suits a ‘research studio’ better than the current system..