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“PEOPLE CAN INHABIT ANYTHING. AND THEY CAN BE MISERABLE IN ANYTHING AND ECSTATIC IN ANYTHING. MORE AND MORE I THINK THAT ARCHITECTURE HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH IT.”

Rem Koolhaas

“A SPACE IS NOT A PLACE UNTILL IS USED FOR A PURPOSE OTHER THAN WHICH THE DESIGNER INTENDED.”

David Engwicht
Favelas have been problematized with conventional paradigms, in most of the cases, with short term or without any success. Fortunately, nowadays, the issue that has been discussed about them is no longer on the removal or relocation of its inhabitants to areas outside the city. (Paola Berestein Jacques – A Estética da Ginga pg17)

The urbanization of these areas has become a vested and an indisputable right. The question is no longer just social and political, but also includes the cultural and aesthetics dimensions.

Besides being part of our culture and artistic heritage, favelas emerge through a unique vernacular architectural and urban process, which not only differs from, but is the very opposite of the traditional design tools from architecture and urbanism scholars. It also composes its own aesthetic, which can be labelled as the 'aesthetic of favelas' or the 'favela pattern'. This aesthetic is completely different from the aesthetics of, what is so called, the formal city, and has singular characteristics.

The rational logic of the architects and planners is still relevant and they end up imposing their own aesthetic, which is related to the formal city. So to say, the favela should become a 'formal' neighbourhood for a better integration with the rest of the city to become possible. What is funny is the concept of functional nowadays. It seems it follows more than the logic of Jean Baudrillard, which work is frequently related to postmodernism and more specific to post-structuralism, as Milton Santos explains on “A Natureza do Espaço” (p.225), as functionality is not anymore what adapts itself to an end, but to an order of a system. In this sense functionality has different meanings for the ‘formal city’ and the favelas.

Favelas are part of the city for over a century. As favelas se formaram antes da ocupação densa de cidades e da dominação de interesses imobiliários. (Ney dos Santos Oliveira, “Favelas and Ghettos: race and Class in Rio de Janeiro and New York City”) So, is a formal integration needed? Wouldn't this be an authoritarian imposition of a formalistic aesthetic towards a standardization of the urban fabric?

Most of the current urbanization projects end up causing the destruction of the original architecture and urban fabric of the favelas in order to create impersonal spaces. Why to not accept the aesthetic of the favelas as legitimate rather than apply architectural and urban aesthetics expectations from traditional practice? Why the traditional standards, learned in the academies, are always the examples to be imposed rather them the inventive and rich, both culturally and formally ‘favela pattern’? Why to not try to learn from the ‘favela pattern’ formal complexity and richness?

A different way of acting, inspired by the favelas, could be interesting, not just for the favelas themselves, but for the city as whole, specially to its borders and frontiers, where architects and urban planners tend to find serious difficulties of intervention, especially due to the lack of the traditional architecture and urban procedures to adequate themselves to these contemporary extreme urban conditions.
Duality

I’m not intended to become a favela dweller. I have nothing against the one who is, but I was raised in the city called ‘formal’, under its terms and conditions. On the other hand, that does not preclude me to appreciate the qualities and richness inherent to the context known as favela, and not even, deprives me to experience it directly or indirectly.

Each and every citizen of the city of São Paulo, consciously or not, possess a relationship with the favelas. It can range from spatial, social, political to monetary. Favelas are not and never were a space that does not belong to us, and the formal city was not and will never be a space that does not belong to the inhabitants of this other reality. Who are the aliens? Nobody, we just live in different conditions. Or maybe, me and you, from the ‘formal reality’, are the aliens, because we don’t about the favela context, as much as they know about us.

Slums are by-products of a capitalist society. Thus, the reason behind their existence are linked to a larger system in which everyone is included, i.e., the capitalist and globalized world. The basic Genes of both realities are the same.

In my opinion the formation of an architect does not happen only inside the academy. The daily-life has the same weight of the books. In my case, the informality presented in my the daily routine complemented my training.

Informality can be seen in different ways around the world. But in general, can be traced as the opposite or complement to formality, i.e., the anti-hero of the rules set by society.

A critical questioning facing the ingenuity and complexity of the spaces of the favelas seems almost inevitable for any architect. On one side I was taught that architecture is always based on formality. Ideas, or ideologies, would become plans, sections, perspectives and design. The process should always be clear and follow some pre-established steps. Basically two parties are involved, the professional and the client. On the other side, in my daily-life, I was used to experience much more things being built without any professional behind, than under one’s supervision or liability. In other words, these ‘other’ spaces, built and inhabited by the ‘other’, the ‘non-architect’, fascinated me far more than the surpriseless spaces available source of materials and with a lot of creativity.

Those informal spaces are extremely present and important for the Brazilian cities. We are not talking just about the favelas, which is the object of study in this work, but also about those spaces created in the formal areas of the city, by people according to their needs and their own knowledge. Take for instance the role of the ‘Ambulante’, or the ‘Carnelil’, which mean hawkers and peddlers. In some cities their presence is so important, that entire buildings were transformed to allocate than. Even entire districts, public squares and other venues are used. Even though, a lot of illegal activities happen within those places, there is not much the government can do about it. It is such a delicate situation, mainly because the amount of people which depend their lives on it.

One thing that Brazilians are really proud of, and I’m not so sure if they should be or not, is what is called as ‘Jeitinho Brasileiro’. This expression means “a way of doing things by circumventing rules and social conventions. It is a typically Brazilian method of social navigation where and individual can use emotional resources, blackmail, family ties, promises, rewards or money to obtain favors or to get and advantage”. Jeitinho Land, excerpts from Brazilian Legacies by Robert M. Levine,” M. E. Sharpe Publishers”, 1997, 212 pp. Literally the expression means to ‘find a way’. It implies the use of the resources at hand, personal connections and, the most important, creativity. The individual which ‘Dá um jeito’, which find a way, is rather a ‘street-smart’ than a ‘book-smart’.

As being part of the Brazilian culture, the ‘Jeitinho Brasileiro’ plays an important role in society. Not just to build up informal conditions, but also formal ones. The way that favelas rose, has much to do with this manner of behaviour. People start constructing their shacks, through the vernacular knowledge, available source of materials and with a lot of creativity.

Much more than sharing the city as space, the favelas have a cultural relationship with the Brazilians. The music style ‘Samba’, one of the most popular cultural expressions associated to the country’s identity, started in the favelas. It is a symbol of the Brazilian ‘Carnaval’, and in addition to its rhythm, it brings a whole historical culture of food, dances, such as ‘miudinho, coco, samba de roda and pernada, parties, clothes and the Art Naïve art (also spelled naïf art) which includes names like Nelson Sargento, Guilherme de Britto and Heitor dos Prazeres. The football, which is also very present in the Brazilian culture, since the beginning of the practice, despite the elitism then in effect, the people got involved with the sport. First as a spectator of the matches between the aristocratic members of the elite of the time. Hence originating the terms “arquibancada” and “g”eral to designate the places for the rich and poor public. Second as a player, founding teams that were not linked to social clubs. The initial impetus was given to football by the combination of the need for a “modern” sports practice for elites and willingness to imitate foreign customs. In Rio de Janeiro, however, after the violent repression of capoeirismo, in 1904, and the urban reform, between 1902 and 1906, which drove hundreds of poor families to the suburbs, a large popular contingent found itself liberated and encouraged to participate in this new and accessible sport. The process of popularizing football in Brazil involved from the beginning, a complex process of struggle against racial prejudice against blacks and mulattos, who formed the largest contingent of the working classes, and were excluded from the sport. But slowly the barriers were broken, and the obvious talent of blacks and mulattos in football could not be ignored for long. The people appropriated the football. It was a popular victory conquest of Vasco da Gama in the State Championship in Rio de Janeiro in 1923, with a team composed of mostly poor blacks and mulattos who were given to play. So, facing the paradigm of amateurism in Brazilian football, annoying leaders and players who were still trying to keep the elitism of football, the technique of the popular player won the discriminatory and elitist imposition. The evolution of football in Brazil is closely linked to the incorporation of the poor population. The involvement of blacks and mulattos with the sport forced the popularization and professionalization. Due primarily to these athletes, the Brazilian players developed technique, skill and ability that distinguish them from any other player. The Brazilian style of football, represented by the famous “ginga”, was inaugurated. (historiografo.blogspot)

Another remarkable point is the social relationships between formal and informal world.

Evidently, it was a fascination that, as always, alloyed attraction and fear about the unknown, the different, the other. I felt a completely ‘alien’ in those spaces, even though there by my side. The ‘favelas’ were for me so far and at the same time so close.
To me, as an architecture student, the modernist paradigm was taught. Not surprisingly, the academic scene was different, mostly the opposite, of the daily-life. Dreams of the perfect world were confronted after the turnstiles, which used to give me access to the university campus, or which used to give me access to the real city. The gates were not anymore a just boundary between public and private spaces. They became much more symbolic. The same fences, which don’t allow the free ground level idea to exist, now are the only way which the modernist paradigm could survive. From city, passing through them, one can find the last resort, of an ideology, that doesn’t match with the contemporary world anymore, the modernism. Behind those fences, ironically, the modernist paradigm can still survive. The same fences that once were abhorred by the modernist architects and urban planners, now become an indisputable right to their survival.
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Favelas in Brazil

The ‘favelas’ in Brazil were originated in the city of Rio de Janeiro, the federal capital in the mid-nineteenth century. Social changes such as the decline of the coffee production in the ‘Vale do Paraíba’ (Paraíba Valley) in the state of São Paulo, the abolition of slavery through the ‘Lei Áurea’ (Golden Law) in 1888, and the beginning of industrial development in the country brought many former slaves and Europeans, mainly from Portugal, to the city.

The misfit populational growth swelled the central area of Rio de Janeiro. In this area, traditionally, were located houses which rooms were rented to low-income families. Each room serving one family and shared sanitary facilities, they were called ‘cortiços’. According to the dictionary of the Portuguese language Priberam, the same term is used to refer to a “cork cylinder within which bees produce wax and honey”. At the same time, the current mayor, Cândido Barata Ribeiro, began a persecution against this type of dwelling, which culminated, in 1893, in the ‘cortiço Cabeça de Porco’ demolition. The dump displaced around 2000 people. Part of them got a permission to build their homes in the ‘Morro da Providência’ (Providence’s Hill), a place situated on the harbor zone. Meanwhile a group of soldiers who fought in ‘Revolta da Armada’ (a movement of rebellion promoted by units of the Brazilian Navy against the government of Marshal Floriano Peixoto, supposedly backed by monarchist opposition to the recent installation of the Republic - Miriam Santana Ilza, Armed Revolt in infoescola) received permission to build their houses on ‘Morro de Santo Antônio’, located in the city center of Rio de Janeiro. Thus the first clusters arose, which came to be called as ‘favelas’. Note that the first land appropriations of the hills were under the consent of the government.

In 1897, something around 20.000 soldiers which had returned to the national capital, Rio de Janeiro, from the ‘Guerra de Canudos’, were living in, an already inhabited, ‘Morro da Providência’, as pre-arranged with the government. During the conflict government troops settled in an area of Canudos called “Morro da Favela”, so as named because of the plant Cnidoscolus quercifolius, popularly called favela, which covered the region. By having housed people who had fought in that conflict, “Morro da Providência”, in Rio de Janeiro, then became popularly called “Morro da Favela”, in reference to original ‘favela’. The name ‘favela’ became popular after 1920, referring to improvised dwellings, without infrastructure, which occupied the hills.

The first current ‘favela’ was recorded in early 1920, although there were similar clusters since the nineteenth century. The housing crisis of the 1940s forced the poorest citizens of cities to raise hundreds of shacks in the suburbs, at the time ‘favelas’ replaced ‘cortiços’ as the main type of dwelling for this population. The era of explosive growth of ‘favelas’ began in the 1940s, with the industrialization process of the government of Getúlio Vargas, until 1970, when ‘favelas’ expanded beyond urban area of Rio de Janeiro.

Most of the current favelas began in the 1970s, when strong economic growth during the Brazilian military regime initiated a rural exodus of workers from poorer states of Brazil towards richer regions, which formed large communities in terms of population. Since these clusters were created, even if under different conditions, but with similar end results, the term ‘favela’ has become generally attributed to any impoverished area of a city.

There are conflicting studies about the number of people living in slums in Brazil. According to official data from the IBGE (Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics) collected during the 2010 Census, about 11.4 million people (6% of the population) live in “substandard clusters”, the government’s definition for slums, with at least 50 people. The IBGE identified 6.329 slums across the country, located in 323 of the 5.565 municipalities.

---

1 (a war between the Brazilian army and members of a grassroots movement of socio-religious background, led by Antônio Conselheiro, between 1896 and 1897, in the community of Canudos, northeast of Brazil - Chaves, José. No tempo de Antônio Conselheiro. Salvador. Livraria Progresso Editora, 1998.)
3 (Macalester College: Slums. Retrieved on December 23, 2011)
4 (Pino, Julio Cesar. Sources on the history of favelas in Brazil.)
6 (Exame (Brasil): 6% dos brasileiros vivem em favelas e similares, diz IBGE (21 de dezembro de 2011). Página visitada em 22 de dezembro de 2011.)
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Favelas in São Paulo

From the 1940s, the process of favelization began in the city of São Paulo. The first São Paulo’s favelas were established in Mococa, the Favela do Oratóriô, Ibirapuera, Barra Funda, with the Favela Ordem e Progresso and Vila Prudente which still sit there. In the following decades this process has exponentially accelerated, mainly due to the huge influx of migrants from various regions of Brazil, especially from the Northeast, searching for work and better living conditions. 1 With no place to live, they occupied vacant lots, without any infrastructure. So, the ‘favelas’ emerged in the city, in the complete abandonment of public policies.

The city of São Paulo always had part of its population living in poor housing conditions. In the second half of the nineteenth century, reports produced by the municipality pointed to the precariousness of the unsanitary cortiços surrounding the central districts of the city. The greatest concern by the municipality’s authorities at the time was that epidemics and pestilences, confined to these localities, to spread to other regions and thus reach various segments of the Paulistana society. 2 Such concern prompted the first actions in the field of hygiene and sanitaryism, in which was recommended the demolition of the cortiços and the construction of dwellings outside the urban perimeter. There was no concern, however, with the establishment of public policies that met this segment of society.

Reflecting on the complex web of relationships between public and private interests that permeate the history of occupation of urban spaces in São Paulo, the authorities delegated to private the arrangements related to the occupation of the territory. Meanwhile, voicing the intention of segregate the people who inhabited these sub-housing and being satisfied just by pushing them away from the city center, without tackling the problem of housing shortage. This mode of action of the government would remain substantially unchanged during most of the twentieth century.

With the demographics growth boom of the city, the problem of substandard housing began to reach even the larger strata of the population, creating around the central neighborhoods a huge ring of suburbs, interspersed with empty and occupied spaces, often constituted by houses, or shacks, built by the residents themselves, with large concentrations of poverty and lacking or insufficiently provided by services, infrastructure and public facilities. It is especially in those regions that the favelas of São Paulo are more concentrated. 3

In 1957, it was estimated at 50,000 the number of ‘favelados’ (slum dwellers) in São Paulo, occupying 8.488 shack in 141 sub-housing cores. A census conducted between 1973 and 1974 pointed to a population of nearly 72,000 inhabitants, ie 1.1% of the total population, living in 14.500 shacks, spreaded into 8.488 shacks in 141 sub-housing cores. A census conducted between 1973 and 1974 pointed to a substantial decrease in the average size of the favelas, from 60 to 30 shack, featuring over 525 slums. A number considerably lower than that estimated by the Movimento Universitário do Povo, which included in its estimates the population of nearly 72,000 inhabitants, ie 1.1% of the total population, living in 14.500 shacks, spreaded into 8.488 shacks in 141 sub-housing cores. 4 Such concern prompted the first actions in the field of hygienism and sanitaryism, in which was recommended the demolition of the cortiços and the construction of dwellings outside the urban perimeter. There was no concern, however, with the establishment of public policies that met this segment of society.

Reflecting on the complex web of relationships between public and private interests that permeate the history of occupation of urban spaces in São Paulo, the authorities delegated to private the arrangements related to the occupation of the territory. Meanwhile, voicing the intention of segregate the people who inhabited these sub-housing and being satisfied just by pushing them away from the city center, without tackling the problem of housing shortage. This mode of action of the government would remain substantially unchanged during most of the twentieth century.

With the demographics growth boom of the city, the problem of substandard housing began to reach even the larger strata of the population, creating around the central neighborhoods a huge ring of suburbs, interspersed with empty and occupied spaces, often constituted by houses, or shacks, built by the residents themselves, with large concentrations of poverty and lacking or insufficiently provided by services, infrastructure and public facilities. It is especially in those regions that the favelas of São Paulo are more concentrated. 3

In a 2009 research, it was found that the number of favelas has stopped growing and it was experiencing a decrease, although the favela population was still growing. 5 Currently the city of São Paulo has the largest amount of ‘favelas’ in Brazil 6 and the second largest population of favelados in the country, staying behind just by the Cidade Maravilhosa (marvelous city), Rio de Janeiro. 7

According to a survey done by the newspaper O Estado de São Paulo in 2011, along with information from the Municipal Housing department, there are about 22 favelas located in prime areas of the city, some of them have more than 5 decades. Most are located in the southwest vector, in the neighborhoods of Vila Mariana, Campo Belo, Planalto Paulista, Moema, Aclimação, Brooklin and Vila Madalena. By situated in narrow streets, away from the grand boulevards, they remain unnoticed for the general population. 8

“My world is the favela, but what worries me is not only the favela of Vila Prudente, but its totality. I see this phenomena as an effect, which cause is not into it. And this represents the system very well. It is part of the capitalist world’s system. What I see: favelas, poverty in the countryside, poverty in all sectors, and I attribute the cause of the favelas, to all this misery. I condemn the system, I condemn the conservatives of this system, which do not accept neither change or structures’ renewal.” - Manoel Francisco Espíndola (1915-1990), presidente da Sociedade Amigos da Favela e coordenador das favelas de São Paulo.
994,926 families live in risk conditions, precarious areas or in terrains with irregular topography. = 25% of the total population of São Paulo live in favelas, allotments, tenements and other irregular areas.

**Favelas**
- 389,122 families
- 24 km² is the occupied area within the city (1.6%)

**Allotment**
- 160,358 families
- 92.0% km² is the occupied area within the city (6.14%)

25% more than in 2004

**Tenements**
- 127,084 families

**Irregular Areas**
- 318,372 families
- 95% are illegal subdivisions with infrastructure but not officially recognized

---

**Construction of New Housing**
Today there are 277,968 popular housing units in the city. By 2015, this number will rise to 371,934, considering the buildings already planned. By that time, 1.4 million people will be living in popular housing in the city, i.e. 12% of the population. On the other hand, there will still remain 1.8 million people living in favelas and substandard housing.

**Renovation of Old Buildings**
In the city center, the municipality plans to renew 53 vacant buildings on properties of public utility. The cost of 135 mi euros to renew them may be able to build 2,500 housing units. The Cambridge Hotel is one of them which corridors will be rearranged and the it will have 115 housing units with around 38m².

**Reurbanization of Favelas**
85,000 families must be benefited in the Favela's Urbanization Program. This program includes several improvements in the favelas, in order to transform them into districts, such as leveling and paving of streets, the channeling of streams, water and sewage systems, garbage collection, health facilities, among others.

**Land Tenure Regularization**
The City Council wants to meet 23,000 families in 108 settlements through the Land Tenure Regularization Program. The program regulates municipal areas irregularly occupied in the city. Besides urban improvements, the work involves the equating of the land tenure base and the legalization of the resident's possession, providing their ingress in the land registry system.

**Watershed Areas**
Mayor Gilberto Kassab, in its mandate, issued a decree amending the Master Plan which allowed the construction of vertical popular housing in the surrounding areas of Billings and Guarapiranga dam. Controversial, the measure predicted the urbanization of 45 slums, the removal of nearly 4000 families and the relocation of another 1300 families within neighboring areas of the dams.
Favelas: Neither Lolita nor Balzac

São Paulo without any doubts is, as Fernando Serapião said, “a urban laboratory for the solutions of the Favelas.” Personally I disagree with the word solution, because this implies that favelas are problems to the city, an old fashioned believe, instead of just different spatial conditions, from which we can learn something. I would re-quote that as São Paulo is an urban laboratory for the exploration on the discourse of the favelas, or slums. It is worth remembering that the favelas have their problems, as well the ‘formal’ parts of the cities.

The project led by the Italian architect Stefano Boeri entitled “Jornada da Habitação – São Paulo Calling”, which includes exhibitions and debates, shows that São Paulo is in the vanguard of the urban discourse about the slums, bidonville, shanty towns, vila miséria, baraccopoli, squatter settlements, and in Brazil, as known as, favela. This project will also engage some other cities like Medellin, Rome, Moscow, Nairóbi, Baghdad and Mumbai.

Universities and institutes from all over the world, including big names such as Harvard, Columbia and ETH, are paying a lot of attention in the works which encompass more than 50 architectural teams worldwide and Brazil, such as MMBB, Brasil Arquitetura, UNA, Urban Think Tank, Christian Kerez among others.

This kind of thought, regarding to the peculiarities and understanding of the favelas, it is an evidence that the discourse has changed since the modernist architecture’s pinnacle, the first half of the 20th century. At that time architects believed that to solve the housing problems they should just build ‘white-ephants’ for housing on the outskirts of large cities, using pre-fabricated pieces in order to design elongated blocks with few storeys on pilotes. The belief on this formula was part of the modernist ideas, by building thousands of dwellings in a Europe devasted by the Second World War. In Brazil, the problem was not regarding to the war consequences, rather the pressures created by the migration from a rural and poor areas to the big cities under development. The master piece of the Brazilian contribution for the discourse was the Pedregulho, by Affonso Reidy, in Rio de Janeiro.

From that time the urban discourse on favelas or informal settlements has changed. The favelas grew a lot and the desire and hope to extinguish them relies in the past. So to speak and evoking ideas from Jane Jacobs, which wrote one of the most important manifestos anti-modernist, the urban planners and architects understood that the built environment in an irregular way could have more potentialities than actually problems. Today they have no doubts that the favelas are consolidated within the cities. So, what to do? Some ideas claims for provision of infra-structure and the regularization of the land tenure situation removing just buildings which are placed in risk zones. By that, they believe that they can improve the conditions of the favelas, once with the regularization there is a natural tendency that the environment will get better, once the community realises that the situation is perennial and not temporary anymore. Somehow the most significant part of this process is invisible towards the public, in other words, infra-structure pictures rarely obtain votes.

But, the cherries on the cake are the new housing blocks which appear as the strong element in the context. However, at this point of the urbanization process for the favelas a paradox emerges. On one side if urban planners believe that ‘acupuncture’ can transform the favelas, the major part of the architects which design those housing buildings still have the modernist blocks as a paradigm.

This conflict becomes more evident when confronting projects for the new dwelling block conceived by international offices. In this scenario two projects really represent the paradox. The first one designed by the Swiss architect Christian Kerez, one of the most interesting architect nowadays in my opinion. To develop the project Kerez spent weeks in São Paulo, together with a community leader, which didn’t speak English or German, trying to understand the place, in this case, an adjacent favela to Paraisópolis, called Jardim Colombo. The results are two volumes that mimic the landscape, incorporating the existent aesthetical language. The second project also comes from Switzerland. A team from ETH designed new blocks, which are concentrated and have a square shaped floor plan. The envelope has different types of exposed bricks cladding, which reveals the individuality of each unity.

Between the foreigner’s perspective, which can be folkloric and find some romanticism in poverty, and national’s one, which cannot get rid of the modernist paradigm, this process to be completed, claims for a third party, which dialogue with the spatiality of the favelas.
UNIDAD VECINAL PORTALES
by B.V.C.H
Santiago
source: wiki.ead.pucv.cl
HOUSING ON THE OUTSKIRTS OF LARGE CITIES, USING PRE-FABRICATED PIECES IN ORDER TO DESIGN ELONGATED BLOCKS WITH FEW STOREYS ON PILE-PIERS.

CONJUNTO HABITACIONAL DE PEDREGULHO
by Alfonso Eduardo Reidy
São Cristóvão
source: Carmen Portinho archive

CONJUNTO HABITACIONAL DE HELIÓPOLIS
by Ruy Ohtake
São Paulo
source: arcoweb.com.br
NEW DWELLINGS IN THE BORDER OF THE FAVELA.

FAVELA DO BAMBURRAL
by Brasil Arquitetura
São Paulo
source: Brasil Arquitetura
MODERNIST BLOCK AS PARADIGM, ACCESS ON MID-LEVELS AS REDDY DID FOR THE PEDREGULHO PROJECT, RENDER AND REPRESENTATION FOLLOW THE LOGIC FOUND IN THE "FORMAL" CITY TO SELL THE IDEA, "FORMAL" CITY.

METROCABLE
by Urban Think Tank
Caracas
source: archinect.com
PROVISION OF INFRA-STRUCTURE IN A HILL FAVELA.

JARDIM COLOMBO
by Christian Kerez
São Paulo
photo: Fabio Knoll
VOLUMES THAT MIRROR THE LANDSCAPE.

CONJUNTO HABITACIONAL DE HELIÓPOLIS
by Alfonso Eduardo Reidy
São Cristóvão
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JARDIM COLOMBO
by Christian Kerez
São Paulo
photo: Fabio Knoll
VOLUMES THAT MIRROR THE LANDSCAPE.
To understand the history of Paraisópolis it is needed to go back in time, specifically for the year 1921. The area where the favela is located today was part of Fazenda do Morumbi (Morumbi's Farm), which was split in 2200 plots by União Mútua Companhia Construtora e Crédito Popular S.A. The infrastructure of the allotmen has not been fully implemented and many of those which purchased plots have never taken actual possession nor paid the taxes.

That is, as has been verified many times in the history of São Paulo, public or private developments which had not completed the implementation phase, eventually becoming barren regions, abandoned. In that way, they became a call for informal occupation.

This process began around 1950, played mostly by Japanese families, aka as posseiros, or squatters, that turned the land into small farms, in addition they acted as grileiros, which is a person who tries to get possession of land with false documents. The ’60s will find this region with fields and cattle. There were few houses and few bars, but with the introduction of upscale neighborhoods like Morumbi, the cemeteries Gethsemani and Morumbi, and the opening of access roads such as Giovanni Gronchi Avenue, the region became an object of great value, awakening economic interest.

In that same decade, was drafted the first Integrated Development Plan of Santo Amaro, which proposed the declaration of the area as a public utility, aimed at further urbanization. However, everything remained on paper, and in 1970 the first wooden shacks began to appear. In this occasion the occupation of Jardim Colombo and Porto Seguro, neighboring Paraisópolis, started.

Still in the 70s, it was decided by the government that the occupation would be restricted to single-family housing and mixed-use, in order to create conditions for deployment of a special plan of occupation to be prepared in 5 years.

Once again the actions did not take place and between 1974 and 1980 the process of occupation of the region has intensified. The growth of the migration process was accelerated even more since 1980. Among the many causes, the ease of finding a job by the strong growth in this region, especially with the growing demand for labor for construction.

In the late ’90s, there was a further increase in population mainly due to the migration of inhabitants of near favelas which were extinguished by the municipality. At this time can be verified a densification in areas such as Grotão and Grotinho, within the Favela Paraisópolis.

Today, the Paraisópolis complex is considered the second largest favela in the city of São Paulo, with 55,590 people and 20,832 properties, plus a network of civil institutions which work in social projects in the favela. The complex is still divided into 5 parts, Grotinho, Grotão, Brejo, Antonico and Centro, and has two other adjacent favelas, Jardim Colombo and Porto Seguro, which were originated around the same time as Paraisópolis.
Romanticizing: Non-formal Conceptual Figures

The use of theoretical concepts in architecture is almost all the time problematic. Usually the concepts are made operative by strictly formal analogies when applied to this discipline. Take for instance Deleuze’s ‘Deconstruction’ or Derrida’s ‘Fold’. Somewhere it is needed to avoid ‘formalist traps’. Therefore one should not study the shapes but the processes and forces which form and transform them specially when analyzing favelas. More than the physical, formal or aesthetic space, the favelas’ temporality is what makes the difference.

The non-formal conceptual figures must overcome the formal sphere to reach the conceptual one. “Only when it comes to the purely conceptual, to the abstraction of a theory, a return to the real is possible: only from this moment some ideas related to the practice of architecture and urbanism can advance.” (Jacques, Paola Berenstein. A Estética da Ginga: A Arquitetura das Favelas Através da Obra de Hélio Oiticica. Rio de Janeiro: Casa da Palavra, 2011, p.19.)

All in all, this part of the work goes in the opposite direction of the formalists, especially the architects whom make use of abstract concepts to apply them formally. The use of non-formal conceptual figures allows a journey from real to the abstract, from formal to conceptual. A reverse engineering.

The figures are origined in three different scales, but all interrelated. The first concerns to the favelas’ sheds, from body to architecture. The second to the set of sheds, from architecture to urban scale. And the third deals with the territorial expansion, from urban to territory. Here they go respectively as the crumbs, the maze and the grasses.

The Crumbs: Shelter of the Favelas

The Crumb is concerned with the idea of the shelter, and consequently, to its temporality in architecture. The first sheds in the favelas are built with fragments from eccentric materials found the builder himself. The builder, in most of the cases, is the ‘favelado’, which is helped by the family or neighbours, with the primary goal to build something which can just shelter him or her and relatives. This first shelter is extremely precarious, moreover, it is the base, or foundation, for further improvements.

Sheltering is act to create an interior space to enter in. This definition can be seen on several levels. The clothes, than the covers, the shelter, the house, the block and finally the city. The main difference between dwelling and sheltering is the temporality. The first is durable and permanent. The second is temporary and provisional. Thus it can be said that the sheds within the favelas are much more closely related to clothig than to architecture. As the notion of ‘becoming’ is part of the provisional state, the shelter might become a dwelling.

Differently from the primitive men, which used to build shelter with available natural resources, the ‘favelado’ will search in the city for the materials. In most of the cases, the first major challenge for building a shack is concerned to the inclination of the site, which imposes a building on stilts. Once the support structure is installed, the exterior walls and roof are attached to it with different techniques, depending on the material. As the ‘favelado’ find other suitable materials, it replaces the old ones. In the begining the shelter is always a single piece which will be expanded over time and according to the manufacturer means. That is, from the beginning the builder should prove having great adaptability and constructive imagination, ie, the “jeitinho Brasileiro” is the way to build a shack in the favelas.

The construction of a shack will never imply the presence of a project. It starts with searching, finding and gathering of materials such as wood, cans and other left-overs from buildings, construction sites and dumps, normally provided by the city called ‘formal’. As these materials are heterogeneous, they lead to a formal fragmentation of the sheds. This fragmented aspect of the constructions becomes less evident in time, since smaller pieces of these materials are replaced by larger ones. One could say that the last stage of a shack’s evolution is the house in masonry, which is no longer so fragmented, but it is still fragmentary, since it is always evolving. In other words, the sheds are fragmentary because they are continuously changing.

The constructions in a favela are never completed at all. There will always be improvements or extensions to be made. Due to this continuous state of incompleteness, the constructive practice in the favelas, as well as the sheds, is fragmentary. Unlike a conventional building, which has a project that determines the completion of the work and its final form, the construction in the favelas does not have one and consequently does not have a pre-established final form, therefore, it never ends.

How is the constructive practice of the sheds, which have to do with chance and incompleteness? The architects of the favelas, in other words, the people who build the sheds are excellent ‘bricoleurs’. According to Lévi-Strauss, “The ‘bricoleur’ is adept at performing a large number of diverse tasks; but, unlike the engineer, he does not subordinate each of them to the availability of raw materials and tools conceived and pro-cured for the purpose of the project. His universe of instruments is closed and the rules of his game are always to make do with ‘whatever is at hand’, that is to say with a set of tools and materials which is always finite and is also heterogeneous because what it contains bears no relation to the current project, or indeed to any particular project, but is the contingent result of all the occasions there have been to renew or enrich the stock or to maintain it with the remains of previous constructions or destructions.” (Lévi-Strauss, Claude. The Savage Mind: The Nature of Human Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966, p.17.)

The actions of the ‘bricoleur’ are not determined by a given project, but by the means and instruments available at the fingertips. “...the ‘bricoleur’ is still someone who works with his hands and uses devious means compared to those of a craftsman.” (Lévi-Strauss, 1966, p.16-17.) The chance, in other words, the unexpected event is part of the actions of the ‘bricoleur’. Unlike the man of the arts, in this case, the architect, the ‘bricoleur’ will never go directly to the goal or toward the wholeness. The ‘bricoleur’ acts according to a fragmentary practice, beating around the bush, in a not a planned and empirical activity. The ‘bricoleur’s’ buildings are therefore an architecture of chance, without a project.

The ‘bricoleur’ of the favela works with second-hand materials, which have already been used
previously. In many cases for different technical purposes, than those used by 'bricoleur'. For example a fiber cement panel designed for roofing can be used as a fence. It is an act of architectural recycling, especially random, which arises from fragmentation of former architectures.

I'm not that type of adept at romanticizing the favelas, mainly because I am aware of their problems. But if it is to romanticize the 'art' of DIY (do it yourself) expressed by 'bricoleur', one can say that, its 'poetry' lies precisely in the dimension of the random outcome, always unexpected, because even if there is always a diffuse intension to build, there is not a detailed and pre-defined form from the beginning.

The 'favelado', which is a 'bricoleur', just want a shelter, which its final form is not known. The 'favelado' works with fragments and in a also a fragmentary way. Thus the construction of the shacks, at the first moment, sticks to the minimum necessary for covering the function of protection.
The Maze: Path of the Favelas

This part is not any more concerned with the shacks themselves, but the set of them. Mainly, regarding to those spaces in between them, which form the tangled internal paths, or alleys, of the favelas.

Anyone from outside the favela, not familiar with the place, gets lost easily in this space due to lack of signage and consistent landmarks. The maze is not perceived as such, from the outside or from far away. For example, from an aerial image. The person only perceives the maze as it is, when inside it. There is no way to verify the labyrinthine condition in its entirety but only in a fragmented way. These conditions are only perceived when the fragments are perceived. One could say that those who never get lost in one of these spaces, do not know what it means to be there.

The maze of the favelas is not planned, much less it has a project behind. Like the shacks, it is not fixed, it is never finished, it is a malleable urban fabric, in which no final map or statement can be traced. For this reason, traditional methods of analysis cannot describe this space. Traditional methods demonstrate fixed conditions, in other words, they are planned. This condition is the opposite of the labyrinthine spaces of the favelas.

The maps provide an overall and non-fragmentary view of the maze’s spatial conditions, because they are made by those who look from above. When viewed from above, the condition of these labyrinthine spaces goes from disorder to order, the mystery is over, in other words, when it seen from above the maze is no longer a maze, because its exits are easily identifiable.

When it comes to a hill favela it is easier to enter it than to leave it, once to leave it, you must always go down, and going down, the exits become more evident. Going up is much more difficult. A strange need a guide which shows the way to the top, avoiding certain places, such as the hiding of traffickers.

In the classic The Oblique Function, which was first developed in the 60’s, Claude Parent and Paul Virilio said that “This tipping of the plane must be understood for what it is: the third spatial possibility of architecture.” The idea was to tilt the ground in order to revolutionize the old paradigm of the vertical wall. The oblique is concerned in how a body physically experience a space. The slope implies an effort to climb up and a speed to climb down. In this sense our bodies feel the degrees of inclination, being impossible to abstract themselves from the space. In the hill favelas, this inclined plane is not designed. It has been around much longer than the occupation itself. It is natural, not artificial. The topography of these spaces can be seen and experienced as a ‘wall’, a barrier. However, being naturally inclined, this ‘wall’ changes the perception of space. In fact, the wall becomes experienceable. Go forward, backward, up, down, left, right, ultimately, every little movement, a new experience. When going up, one makes a lot of effort, and the eyes are focused on the plane on which one walks. One cannot have a very broad notion of the spaces. While descending, one must make an effort to slow down, and the eyes tend to look to the horizon, so having a much larger view of the space than going up.

The experience of going up or down a favela is a unique spatial perception. As one passes through the first ‘quebrada’, a rhythm of walking differently is found, imposed by the route of the alleys. The dance of the samba would be in a mimetic relationship with the pace of the ‘quebradas’. The samba is developed in the favelas, and it is danced throughout the city during Carnival. During the school’s parade, the ‘passistas’ wearing costumes, cross the ‘Sambódromo’ dancing in zigzag, like in a imaginary labyrinth. The samba dancing is therefore a representation of the favelas’ alleys, the expression of the labyrinthine spatial experience that contaminates body movements. Who dances the samba repeats the physical experience of going through the meanders of the favelas. This confused space, difficult to be apprehended, find in the samba, its better representation.
Grasses: Expansion of the Favelas

One can draw an analogy between the growth of favelas through the territory with the grasses which grow in the wastelands of the cities. The shacks of the favelas occupy an empty land just like the grasses that rises slightly at the edges of it and then occupy the entire ground.

This kind of occupation creates a paradox within the city. While the city called formal has the center more valuable than the periphery, the favelas generally have the periphery more valuable than the center. Moreover, it can be said that the favelas have no center, if we take into account the traditional notion of center in the cities. In the favelas the periphery, ie, the line that separates it from the rest of the city becomes the center, not geographical but symbolic; that is, the center is no longer a fixed point, rather it is a line that moves.

The favelas have emerged in almost all parts of the cities. In unused public spaces, in abandoned lots, in spaces left empty by the ‘real estate machine’, in places where it is impossible or too expensive to build, among others. The shelters come amid the city, between the traditional neighborhoods, forming enclaves, ie, a microterritory inside larger ones. The invasion of an empty lot and its occupation by shelters form a new territory in the city.

The favelas transcend the boundaries of the land that they occupy. They go beyond their physical limits through their relationships with the city, especially through bonds that are established in a more subtle and penetrating way, that means, through individual relationships, since most of the ‘favelados’ work in formal neighborhoods of the city.

It can be said that the occupation of the favelas is made at three levels. The occupation of empty land in the city. The displacement or relocation of the favelas in the city. And the relations between the favelados with the formal city. These three levels of occupancy and development do not follow the logic of the tree of the conventional cities.

Christopher Alexander, in his text against the new urbanism, not the urban design movement which promotes walkable neighborhoods containing a range of housing and job types from the 80’s, but the new in opposition from what have been done until that time, “The City Is Not a Tree, from 1965, makes a connection between the structures of city planning and the arborescent structures of thought. His criticism is aimed at the constructions of the modern cities, which he calls as artificials, and goes in defense of natural cities, ie cities vernacular, not designed. “We are concerned with the difference between structures in which no overlap occurs, and those structures in which overlap does occur. ... It is this lack of structural complexity, characteristic of trees, which is crippling our conceptions of the city.” (Alexander, Christopher. A City is Not a Tree. 1965.)

His text matters, especially by trying to understand the logic that structure a city, trying to prove through diagrams that artificial cities (“... I shall call those cities and parts of cities which have been deliberately created by designers and planners...” Alexander, 1965.) effectively follow a tree structure and natural cities (“I want to call those cities which have arisen more or less spontaneously over many, many years natural cities.” Alexander, 1965.) follow the semilattice structure, which is more complex. “... a tree based on 20 elements can contain at most 19
further subsets of the 20, while a semilattice based on the same 20 elements can contain more than 1,000,000 different subsets." (Alexander, 1965.)

"The semilattice goes like this: A collection of sets forms a semilattice if and only if, when two overlapping sets belong to the collection, the set of elements common to both also belongs to the collection. …The tree axiom states: A collection of sets forms a tree if and only if any two sets that belong to the collection either one is wholly contained in the other, or else they are wholly disjoint." (Alexander, 1965.)

To Alexander, the architects and planners organize the city as a tree because they are used to the thinking system that works in the logic of the tree. This way of thinking is quite simple, binary, and architects became unable to reflect in a more complex way, which would be the semilattice system of thinking. "In simplicity of structure the tree is comparable to the compulsive desire for neatness and order..." (Alexander, 1965.)

"The natural city of Middlesbrough was faithful to the semilattice structure of the units. Only in the artificial-tree conception of the city are their natural, proper and necessary overlaps destroyed." (Alexander, 1965.)

The favelas are even more complex than those cities called natural, with the semilattice logic of Alexander, since the favelas are in constant changing, they never finished their development and growing and, above all, are not so fixed or statics as the cities said formal, artificial or natural, planned or unplanned.

The planned city, as the tree is firmly rooted in the root system, which is the image of the order. The not fully planned city functions as a radicle system more complex. And the favela follows the rhizome system, that Alexander would find difficulties to demonstrate in his rational and cartesian diagrams, ie, arborescent.

The process of the rhizome is the thought of multiplicity, ‘centerless’, non-hierarchical and unstable, as opposed to the binary thinking, ie the opposite to the thought of the tree, which is rooted. While the radicle thinking, for keeping the tree structure, is characterized by a false multiplicity. The rhizome has no accurate picture. What matters is the process more than the formal image, the impulsive, violent and sudden movement itself, the germination, the growth.
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MATRİX

crossing data
In order understand the history of Paraísopolis a travel back in time is needed. Everything has started in 1921. The area where the favela is located nowadays was part of Fazenda do Morumbi (Morumbi’s Farm), which was split in 2200 plots by União Mútua Companhia Construtora e Crédito Popular S.A. The infrastructure of the allotment has not been fully implemented and many of those which purchased plots have never taken actual possession nor paid the taxes.

As has been verified many times in the history of São Paulo public and private developments which had not completed the implementation phase eventually became abandoned regions. In this sense they became a lure for informal occupation.
The occupation began around 1950 conducted mostly by Japanese families, as known as posseiros (squat-ters), which turned the land into small farms. Moreover they acted as grileiros, a person who tries to get possession of land with false documents. The '60s will find this region with fields and cattle. There were few houses and few bars but with the introduction of upscale neighborhoods like Morumbi, the cemeteries Getsemaní and Morumbi, and the opening of access roads such as Giovanni Gronchi Avenue, the region became an object of great value, awakening economic interest.

In the 60's, as well, it was drafted the first Integrated Development Plan of Santo Amano, which declared the area as a public utility, aiming future urbanization. However, everything remained on paper. In 1970 the first wooden shacks began to appear. In this occasion the occupation of Jardim Colombo and Porto Seguro, neighboring Paraisópolis, started.

Still in the 70s, it was decided by the government that the occupation would be restricted to single-family housing and mixed-use, in order to create conditions for deployment of a special plan of occupation to be prepared in 5 years.

Once again the actions did not take place and between 1974 and 1980 the process of occupation of the region has intensified. The growth of the migration process was accelerated even more since 1980. Among the many causes, the ease of finding a job by the strong growth in this region, especially with the growing demand for labor for construction.

In the late '90s, there was a further increase in population mainly due to the migration of inhabitants of near favelas which were extinguished by the municipality. At this time can be verified a densification in areas such as Grotão and Grotinho, within the Favela Paraisópolis.
Nowadays Paraisópolis is considered the second largest favela in the city of São Paulo, with 45,694 people and 17,141 properties, plus a network of institutions which work in social projects within the favela.

Paraisópolis is divided in 4 parts (Grotinho, Grotao, Centro Brejo and Antonico) and has two other adjacent favelas, Jardim Colombo and Porto Seguro, which were originated around the same time.
territorial expansion
Paraisópolis was originated from the division of the former Morumbi Farm to be an allotment for the construction of houses for the upper class in 1921. The former farm was divided into 2,200 lots of 10x50m within regular blocks of 100x200m and 10m wide streets.
Programa de regularização urbanística e fundiária

• Objetiva promover a regularização urbanística das áreas públicas municipais ocupadas por população de baixa renda, através da outorga de termos de Concessão de Uso para Fins de Moradia;
• segurança da posse: posse legalizada, através da outorga de termos de concessão ou autorização de uso; registro das áreas e dos termos de concessão ou autorização nos CRIs.
• integração formal das áreas na cidade: endereço oficial; IPTU; facilitação do acesso oficial a serviços públicos (água, esgoto, etc.).

Regularização Fundiária

Para viabilizar as intervenções pretendidas em área particular, principalmente a construção de unidades habitacionais para reagrupamento de famílias:
• foram criados instrumentos jurídicos que possibilitam e estimulam doações de terrenos particulares ao poder público;
• está sendo desapropriada pela PMSP uma área vazia de 190 mil m² onde serão implantados edifícios residenciais, equipamentos públicos, áreas verdes e obras viárias importantes.

“Aquele que, até 30 de junho de 2001, possuía como seu, por cinco anos, ininterruptamente e sem oposição, até duzentos e cinquenta metros quadrados de imóvel público situado em área urbana, utilizando-o para sua moradia ou de sua família, tem o direito à concessão de uso especial para fins de moradia em relação ao bem objeto da posse, desde que não seja proprietário ou concessionário, a qualquer título, de outro imóvel urbano ou rural.”

Existem dois novos instrumentos de regularização que foram aprovados pela Lei 11.977 de 07 de Julho de 2009.
• demarcação urbanística: procedimento administrativo pelo qual o Poder Público, no âmbito da regularização fundiária de interesse social, demarca imóvel de domínio privado, definindo seus limites, área, localização e confrontantes, com a finalidade de identificar seus ocupantes e qualificar a natureza e o tempo das respectivas poses;
• legitimação de posse: ato do Poder Público destinado a conferir título de reconhecimento de posse de imóvel objeto de demarcação urbanística, com a identificação do ocupante e do tempo e natureza da posse;
topography
The typical territorial occupation by the favelas creates a paradox within the city. While the city called formal has the center more valuable than the periphery, the favelas generally have the periphery more valuable than the center. Moreover, it can be said that the favelas have no center, if we take into account the traditional notion of center in the cities. In the favelas the periphery, ie the line that separates it from the rest of the city, becomes the center, not geographical but symbolic, that is, the center is no longer a fixed point, rather it is a line that moves.

In the case of Paraisópolis, this paradox relies not on the differences between center and periphery, rather in their qualities in common. The "symbolic center" now becomes the periphery of each block. Each block is a point. In other words, the center is not just a point or a line that moves, but the main urban structure of the favela.

Commercial activities proclaim the borders of the urban blocks as the most valuable land within the favela, maintaining a constant and direct relationship, in spatial and programatic terms, with the urban grid.
Residences as everywhere, in every shape, height and position within the favela. They are the basic typology of every single favela.

The first shacks in the favelas are built with fragments from eccentric materials found by the builder himself. Differently than the primitive men, which used to build shelter with available natural resources, the favelado will search around the city for the materials. The favelado primary goal to build something which can just shelter him or her and relatives. This first shelter is a single piece extremely precarious, moreover, it is the base, or foundation, for further improvements.

Sheltering is an act to create an interior space to enter in. This definition can be seen on several levels. The clothes, than the covers, the shelter, the house, the block and finally the city. The main difference between dwelling and sheltering is the temporality. The first is durable and permanent. The second is temporary and provisional. Thus it can be said that the shacks within the favelas are much more closely related to clothing than to architecture. As the notion of ‘becoming’ is part of the provisional state, the shelter might become a dwelling.

The construction of a shack will never imply the presence of a project. It starts with searching, finding and gathering of materials such as wood, cans and other leftovers from buildings, construction sites and dumps, normally provided by the city called formal. As these materials are heterogeneous, they lead to a formal fragmentation of the shacks. This fragmented aspect of the constructions becomes less evident in time, since smaller pieces of these materials are replaced by larger ones. One could say that the last stage of a shack’s evolution is the house in masonry, which is no longer so fragmented, but it is still fragmentary, since it is always evolving. In other words, the shacks are fragmentary because they are continuously changing.

The constructions in a favela are never completed at all. There will always be improvements or extensions to be made. Due to this continuous state of incompleteness, the constructive practice in the favelas, as well as the shacks, is fragmentary. Unlike a conventional building, which has a project that determines the completion of the work and its final form, the construction in the favelas does not have one and consequently does not have a pre-established final form, therefore, it never ends.
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Starting point of a study which tries to analyse and find a pattern between public and private spaces.

Edifications are clustered around primary accesses, which is the controlling parameter for their orientations and build-up.

Work as a shortcut. They can be end blind due to reconfiguration of the edifications' position and build-up.

Starting point of a study which tries to analyse and find a pattern between public and private spaces.
Original plans:
- buildings set the shape of public space
- public and private spaces are dependent on each other
- the height of a edification follows a master plan, dictated by zoning laws
- the public space is more about flows/comune
- any type of program is allowed
- expansions are done vertically and horizontally
- the size and shape is defined by informal agreements
- public space is designed to set buildings
- public and private spaces are independent on each other
- the height of a edification follows a master plan, dictated by zoning laws
- the public space is more about flows/comune
- any type of program is allowed
- expansions are not allowed
- master plan defines the space

Current situation:
- buildings set the shape of public space
- public and private spaces are dependent on each other
- the height of an edification follows the desires, necessities and financial opportunities of its owner
- any type of program is allowed
- the public space is, rather than a place just for circulation, also a event space
- the size and shape of a construction is dependent on its neighbour’s, finding the better shape and size which fit in the place
- expansions are done vertically and horizontally
- interpersonal and others informal agreements define the space
DESIGN
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add horizontal public space
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open to Paraisopolis
Structure can be evaluated emotionally; envelopes will surely also be.

Structure and envelope can be separated from each other.

User’s emotions might change. However, structure can only be changed with great difficulty.

Envelopes can be changed relatively easily.

The function map is what can be changed most easily. It is concerned to the inhabitant, the user of the building.

Function maps or topological graphs can be changed most easily.

Envelopes can be changed relatively easily.

The supporting structure (the skeleton) is the most unchangeable component of the architectural artefact.