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Introduction

For my graduation project, I am designing a temporary performance place for Lowlands festival. In this reflection, I will explain the way I have worked on this project and how this has effected the results. I started this project from my personal fascination for music and architecture. This gave me an extra motivation to make this project work. I truly believe that what I am designing could change the way we look at temporary architecture for music festivals. It can be high quality architecture without losing its temporary character.
Reflection

Method of research

The topic of my research (finding what creates a good temporary performance place) was quite broad. I started researching existing projects and collecting these in a database. These projects could inspire me and other architects in designing a new kind of performance place. However, because my topic was so broad it was difficult to analyse these projects. I tried to find aspects in these projects that added to ‘the value of the performance place’ in ways of acoustics and user experience, but it was too vague. Categorizing labels did not work and therefore I could not structure the database well enough. I decided to take a step back and rewrite what my goal was. I discovered that finding what creates a good performance place could not be done through analysing and rating ‘random’ projects. I had to talk to experts about what they think are good performance places.

My new method was therefore: interviews. I choose to do 15 qualitative interviews with musicians, visitors and sound engineers. This way I could cover the two main aspects of my research: user experience and acoustics. The interviews could be analysed more easily since they were quite comparable. I was very happy with most of the people I spoke to. I started with looking for people to interview within my own contacts. However, the artists and sound engineers I spoke to were not usually working or performing at large events. When I got the chance to speak to bigger artists (Maartje & Kine, Torre Florim) and more experienced sound engineers (for example the sound engineer designer for Lowlands festival). Therefore, I got more inside information, but the interviews were not completely comparable.

The lack of interviewees led to non-scientific results. However, comparing the results of the interviews to literature references did create a more scientific base for the research. Furthermore, I am not an experienced interviewer and due to a late change of research method, I do not think the interviews could have been improved that much.

With the results from the interview I created a clear overview of what the three main user groups needed, what they think of existing temporary performance places and what their perfect performance place would be. I am very happy about this switch in approach. The method was very clear, the result was clear and thus the research created a good foundation for my project.

Even though the interviews worked well, the analysis of the results did not run smoothly at first. Each interview led to a set of labels that could again be compared. I wanted to create a toolbox for the architect, but the labels were no architectural tools yet. Therefore, the conclusion of the research was
Paradiso is a phenomenon in the world. It was built as a church for the ‘vrije gemeente’ in 1880 by Salm. When they moved out in 1965, the building was almost destroyed to be replaced by a hotel because of its prime location in the city. Rebellious youths prevented this and squatted the building. They could convince the municipality to let them turn this building into a culture centre. Since 1968 Paradiso has been a pop venue, creative centre, place for cultural innovation and freedom. Many artists from all over the world come here to perform and new bands are discovered here.

Paradiso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>G.B. Salm / Archvold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Amsterdam, The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1880 / 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>1500 + 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>cultural centre &amp; pop temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Database example

Interview set-up
broader than I had in mind. This had multiple reasons. The first is that the question in the first place was broad – this will lead to a broad answer. The second reason is that I asked non-architects, therefore the tools that came from the interviews were non-architectural. The last reason is that the design and the research partially overlap. I will explain this issue later.

Method of design
After the P2 presentation I immediately started collecting ideas. I already had a sketch idea, but I also had this image in mind of a wooden structure and thin fabrics. I started with testing some fabrics in the impedance tube and these results were more positive than I had expected. The idea of using thin fabrics was kept. After starting different experiments within construction, acoustics and analysis of the terrain, I still did not have a direction. I was stuck in the dilemma of too many stakeholders. My research explained the needs of the users, but I had my own wishes and Mojo (the organisation behind the festival) had different needs as well. Each time I had an idea, I tried to fit it in these different wishes. This did not work because these wishes were conflicting. I needed to specify what my final goal was. A temporary, realistic tent that could be sold to Mojo immediately, a new tent for many festivals or a tent for Lowlands that was innovative and maybe too expensive? I put all different needs and wishes together and specified how important these wishes were for me, for the TU Delft (as a graduation project) and for Mojo. This resulted in a very clear project description.

Later in my process I used the same method with more specific needs and wishes to test my different design ideas. For this I reread my research to create this list. This list of requirements gave me grip on my decision making.

As I told before, I started this project with some ideas on acoustics and construction. Later I tested these ideas on a larger scale. The switching between scales worked very well. My technical details are already developed a lot in an early stage. This is very important for my project because building the construction within two weeks is part of my design project.

After P3, I reflected on the work I had done and it seemed I only had a few things yet to figure out. However, after making some construction calculations, I found out that my construction was a lot heavier than I had originally anticipated on. I did not want to change the design too much and therefore I needed to know how I could build this temporary construction. My tutors told me to try and find an expert on temporary construction to help me out. I found a construction teacher at the faculty of civil engineering
Decision making

sketch models
that had a lot of experience with building in wood and had worked at Tentech before, meeting with him and later with the head of Tentech as well helped me a lot. They explained how these constructions are usually build and even though a construction like this is not often made in wood, they helped projecting existing details and methods onto my design.

The design in the end has a very high amount of detailing, but since the project is relatively simple, I think this was necessary. Furthermore, the detailing gives the project a lot more credibility and even though it is an innovative and expensive idea, it is very realistic due to the detailing.

Focussing on large scale and conceptual ideas before P3 helped me a lot in working out all of these construction elements. Working on the P4, I am able to zoom out again and find all the influences these details have and enriching even the larger scale.

**Combination of research and design**

As explained before, the research gave a very clear base for the design project. Nonetheless, I realised later in the project how much I could still use the research. Going back to the research during the design project made me reflect on my design in between which is very useful for a project that is developed individually.

The research did change the design a lot. Not only gave it a base for the project description, it also gave the design direction. For example, the questions I asked in the interviews did not only consider temporary performance places, but also regular pop and concert halls. This lead to a design of a temporary concert hall instead of a tent. This is a good thing because the design reimagines temporary performance places that need the quality of permanent performance places. On the other hand, it makes the design a lot more expensive and thus less realistic. The dialogue between quality and temporariness is constantly present in the design process.

**Theme of graduation lab**

The theme I choose for my graduation is ‘Make’. Most students that choose this topic, research something very technical that is related to this. However, my research was similar to research done for product design instead of architecture. This fit the project well, but at first I was afraid the theme was not present enough. However, as soon as I started the design face, the MAKE approach worked very well. I started from details, tested acoustic qualities of fabric etc. Personally, I am very happy with this topic. The futuristic tent becomes a lot more realistic if I can show that it can be build.

The MAKE approach is something that fits
me as an architect very well. I truly believe in the importance of construction, making and detailing of a project in a way that it makes the architecture. Furthermore, I am quite practical and to the point, so this theme fits me as a person as well.

**Future planning**

The planning I had made in my graduation plan was constantly changing. For the P3 presentation I had many experiments to show which all come together in the first design. I did not use computer simulation yet and also did not do a lot of reference analysis. The computer analysis that could have been useful for acoustic tests can be made if the design is worked out more, but is also less important than anticipated. Using these programs is quite difficult and might be nice for after the P4 presentation but only to show that it can be done and it cannot affect the design a lot anymore.

Reference analysis could have helped me a bit more in the beginning of the process, but I already had a lot of input, so it was not necessary.

For the P5 presentation I want to make a big model. This model should be build up like how the design is built in real life. I can then use pictures of the model to show how this works. Furthermore, I want to be able to make beautiful pictures of the inside of the construction of the model as well.

In the last weeks of this graduation project, I will be able to zoom out even further and see how the design can become even stronger. I think most of the different aspects have already fallen in its place, but the different elements of the design could be incorporated even more. I would love it if I can present a design that ‘clicks’ at my P5 presentation.
THETMATIC RESEARCH

- literature
- interviews

DESIGN RESEARCH

- computer simulation
- material tests
- reference analysis
- form-finding

TOOLBOX

DESIGN