BOB ZWINKELS
- RENE BRAKELS
THE EVER INCREASING GLOBAL AND NATIONAL POPULATION IS AN ISSUE THAT REQUIRES A BUILT ANSWER. THE INCREASE RESULTS IN A NEED FOR MORE HOUSING AS WELL AS MORE WORKSPACES. UPTO THE 21ST CENTURY, CITIES HAVE ALWAYS EXPANDED INTO THEIR FIELDS AND TAKING LAND FROM NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES. VIXEX HAS BEEN AN ATTEMPT DURING THE LATE 20TH/ EARLY 21ST CENTURIES TO DEAL WITH THIS ISSUE IN SIMILAR MANER BY CREATING WHOLE NEW NEIGHBORHOODS JUST OUTSIDE CITIES.

NOWADAYS HOLLAND IS TREASURING THE GREEN SPACES AROUND CITIES MORE AND MORE AND COMES TO TERMS THAT VINEX WAS NOT THE ANSWER THEY HAD THOUGHT IT WOULD BE.

DENSIFICATION THEREFORE IS A DIFFERENT ANSWER TO THE GROWING NEED FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT. WITHIN THE CITY MANY UNUSED INDUSTRIAL AREAS ARE NOW REDEVELOPED TO FACILITATE A MIX OF HOUSING, WORKING AND PUBLIC FUNCTIONS. BY UPDATING THE USE OF LAND WITHIN CITIES MANY NEW PEOPLE CAN COME ENJOY CITY LIFE WITHOUT DAMAGING THE OPEN FEEL A CITY MIGHT HAVE.

IN ORDER TO INVESTIGATE THESE TYPE OF URBAN TRANSFORMATIONS, THREE SIMILAR ISLANDS IN AMSTERDAM HAVE BEEN SELECTED WITH AN INDUSTRIAL HISTORY. WITHIN THESE LARGER ASSEMBLIES, ONE BUILDING HAS BEEN SELECTED THAT PORTRAIS THE HIGH DENSITY TRANSFORMATION WELL FROM A DWELLING POINT OF VIEW. FROM COMPARING THESE PROJECTS, CHARACTERISTICS CAN BE DISTILLED BY PLACING THEM SIDE BY SIDE.

PEOPLE WHO HAVE ALREADY LOOKED AT HIGH DENSITY IN URBAN SETTINGS FROM A THEORETICAL VIEWPOINT IS RUDY ÜY-TENHAAK WHO WROTE PRACHTIG COMPACT NL AND CITIES FULL OF SPACE: QUALITIES OF DENSITY. ALSO PERMETA ARCHITECTS HAS WRITTEN ABOUT THIS SUBJECT IN THEIR BOOK SPACEMATE.

IN ORDER TO ANALYSE DENSITY, THREE MAIN THEORETICAL ASPECTS PLAY A PART. THE FLOOR SPACE INDEX (FSI), THE GROUND SPACE INDEX (GSI) AND THE OPEN SPACE RATIO (OSR), SEE BELOW FOR A DIAGRAMATIC REPRESENTATION OF THESE TERMS.

WE HAVE ANALYSED THE PROJECTS ON THEIR RELATION WITH THE SURROUNDING CITY, THE RELATIONS WITHIN THE ISLANDS AND WITHIN THE SELECTED BUILDING.
WHAT ARE THE (SPATIAL) CHARACTERISTICS OF DENSIFIED URBAN TRANSFORMATIONS

RESEARCH QUESTION

THE ISSUE OF DENSIWFICATION OF CITIES IS MAINLY FOCUSED ON TRANSFORMING ABANDONED INDUSTRIAL AND HARBOR AREAS FROM THE LAST CENTURY. THE METHODS FOR THESE HIGH DENSITY TRANSFORMATIONS VARY. THE QUESTION ARISES WHAT LESSONS CAN BE LEARNED FROM THESE TRANSFORMATIONS.

SELECTED PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>1. OOSTERDOKSEILAND, AMSTERDAM</th>
<th>2. WESTERDOKSEILAND, AMSTERDAM</th>
<th>3. KNSM ISLAND, AMSTERDAM</th>
<th>4. PLOT 2, OOSTERDOKSEILAND</th>
<th>5. LA GRANDE COUR, WESTERDOKSEILAND</th>
<th>6. PIRAEUS, KNSM ISLAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE AREA</td>
<td>+/- 46.000 m²</td>
<td>+/- 50.000 m²</td>
<td>+/- 118.200 m²</td>
<td>+/- 2.650 m²</td>
<td>+/- 8.000 m²</td>
<td>+/- 8.800 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUILT AREA</td>
<td>+/- 266.740 m²</td>
<td>+/- 150.000 m²</td>
<td>+/- 206.700 m²</td>
<td>+/- 27.750 m²</td>
<td>+/- 37.600 m²</td>
<td>+/- 43.000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSI</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPARATIVE CONCLUSIONS
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Aspects of project analyses per scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Island</th>
<th>Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Morphology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relation to the City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public Space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Density</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Island level:
Access is split into roads and building entries.
Public space is split into public accessible space and green space.
Density is split in building levels and volume density with figures.

At building level:
Access is split into entrances and building circulation
Density is split into building levels, and volume density with figures
Diversity is split into program and apartment typology diversity

Analyses methods
- Morphological
- Perspectives
- Sections
- Diagrams
- Photographs
Project locations in Amsterdam
The Oosterdokseiland is an island situated between the eastern dock and the river IJ. The eastern dock was created in 1832 at the moment the eastern dock dam was finished. Because of it, the city part of the IJ got liberated from the tides as the IJ was still connected to the Zuiderzee at the time. In the ‘60s a plot of land south of the eastern dock is cleared for the construction of the PTT (national post) headquarters. Yet in the beginning of the ‘90s the PTT decides not to transport via railroad anymore but via the road. This decision has direct consequences for the housing of the company as it moves to Sloterdijk. In response to this, Amsterdam decided to develop a longterm vision plan for the IJ-banks. This resulted in plans for Oosterdokseiland in 1996.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Urban design: Erik van Egeraat Associated Architects
Architectural design: 11 architects, a.o.: Crepain Binst, Jo Coenen & Co Architecten, De Architecten Cie
Landscape design: Agence Ter
Client/Developer: MAB Development
Date of Completion: 2007-
Status: Under Construction
### Project Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Redevelopment / Function Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location Size</td>
<td>46,000 m², 560m x 120m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Level</td>
<td>Transition City-Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanity</td>
<td>High - Extremely High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Themes</td>
<td>Mixing of Functions, High Density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC SPACE

ACCESS

PARKING

DENSITY

DIVERSITY
Integration into the urban fabric by means of large volumes similar to the old city center. The question is if these are actually comparable, as van Egeraat claims the pattern is a derivative of the urban pattern of the existing city.

1:7500
WATER

The area is bound to its surroundings by the body of water that envelopes the island from the sides and from the front. The water gives the island large amounts of visual open space as a counter to the dense development of the island.

1:7500
Access

The island has two main entrances for cars with one connecting road at the back of the island. The area is pedestrian friendly and well accessible by public transportation. The trainstation, bus station and metro stops are within a few minutes walking distance.

1:7500
Important public places that have means to stay there, such as seats, but also have commercial facilities to make a stay more attractive.
As it is an island there is lots of visual open space from which the icons of the city are visible, such as the church towers and museums.
Panoramic view
The island has two main entrances for cars with one connecting road at the back of the island, as shown in image 1. The area is pedestrian friendly with bridges to the east of the city.
Access to office functions are restricted to the back and sides of the blocks. Apartments have entrances on the front and side, while commercial functions have access from the front only where the public is.

1:3500
1. Educational entrances

2. Office entrances
Public outdoor space is mainly focussed at the water front.

1:3500
Public space

1. Public space at hotel

2. Public space at Library
The only green spaces on the island are a few trees along the waterfront. The inner courtyards of the buildings are not accessible and not green.
Access | Public Space | Parking | Density | Diversity

1. Open space plot 2

2. Green space at the hotel
Parking

There is no street parking on the entire island. There is one big, two story public parking garage underneath the entire island, from which you can directly access all functions.

1:3500
Parking is the only entrance/exit of the parking garage.

THE ONLY ENTRANCE/EXIT OF PARKING GARAGE
Most of the island’s land has been built upon. Streets are only 8 meters wide. The open spaces are all on the south of the island at the waterfront. The volumes slowly move from 8 stories at the west to 14 in the east in a swooping motion creating a dynamic flow.
**Figures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Area</td>
<td>46.912m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footprint Built</td>
<td>19.463m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Built Area (incl. Parking)</td>
<td>266.740m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Space Index</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Space Index</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Ratio</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The program of the island has many different functions. This mixture gives a natural dynamic to the area with variation in users at different times. Offices are in the back, commercial functions at plinth level at the front, with apartments on top.
Plot 2 is part of Oosterdokseiland. It consists of offices and apartments on a double layer of commercial space. Vodafone is occupant of the entire office area, whilst the commercial space is split up into smaller volumes, of which one is going to be rented to &Samhoud. 2 Michelin Star cook Moshik Roth will be the chef there. It will be part of one of the many attractions that will draw many people to the island.

It can be clearly seen that the building has three different architects as the three parts have a distinct materialization. The offices are made up of dark precast concrete panels that jump out, while the apartments at the square have a flat brick facade and the apartments to the east have textured metal cladding.

The columns supporting the offices over the main road at the back of the island are V-shaped precast concrete.

General Information

Architectural design: Architekturbüro Baumschlager Eberle, HvdN Architecten, MaccreanorLavington Architects
Client/Developer: MAB Development
Date of Completion: 2012
Status: Under Construction
PROJECT FEATURES

TYPOLOGY
LOCATION SIZE
BUILDING SIZE
URBANITY
PROGRAM
HOUSING TYPOLOGY

CLOSED BUILDING BLOCK, WITH COURTYARD AS ROOF WITHOUT ACCESS
2,650 m², 60m x 50m
27,750 m²
HIGH
OFFICES, APARTMENTS, COMMERCIAL SPACES
SINGLE STORY AND DUPLEXES
Access to office functions are restricted to the back and sides of the block. Apartments have entrances on the front and side, while commercial functions have access from the front only where the majority of people pass by.

1:1000
The open plan offices has one main core with elevators and two additional escape staircases. The apartments have various types of access, one part has one main core with internal hallways. The other part has two cores with two elevators and exterior galleries to the street.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESS</th>
<th>PUBLIC SPACE</th>
<th>PARKING</th>
<th>DENSITY</th>
<th>DIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Circulation
**Building Levels**

The building height of the block steps down from the railroad towards the open water at the south, from 12 stories to 9.
**Figures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area</td>
<td>2.650m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footprint built</td>
<td>2.620m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total built area (exl. parking)</td>
<td>26.750m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Space Index</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Space Index</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Ratio</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The building consists of offices, and apartments on top of a commercial two story plinth. Underground the commercial space continues as well as storage space for the apartments and offices.
**APARTMENT DIVERSITY**

There are four types of apartments, ranging from a one bedroom to a four bedroom apartment. Within this type and size range, there are also various shapes of the type of apartments from single story to duplexes.
In this section it is clearly visible how the functions mix. Also the relation to the adjacent buildings are clearly seen. The streets are 8 meters wide with 13 story high sides. The courtyard is not accesible and is only there to privide light and air.

1:750
Program section

The offices are to the north, while the apartments are facing south to the water with views of the city. The main street is located underneath the offices, while the boulevard stretches the south end. The commercial functions bind everything together.

1:750
Westerdokseiland is an island in Amsterdam between the Westerdok and the IJ, west of central station. It originated in 1832, when, because of the construction of the Westerdoksdam, it became separated from the IJ. On the west the enclosed body of water now called Westerdok emerged. On the east side the Oosterdok was created similarly. Westerdokseiland was for years mainly used as a railway yard. The island, measuring barely four acres of land has a strong relation with harbour history of Amsterdam. In recent years large-scale high density developments have been realized along the southern banks of the IJ. Westerdokseiland is one of these developments. The water in the Westerdok now functions as a marina with moorings for recreational boats and house boats along the southern part of the Westerdokseiland.

GENERAL INFORMATION

URBAN DESIGN: OD205
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN: 12 ARCHITECTS, a.o.: MVRDV, AWG ARCHITECTS, DKV ARCHITECTS, HEREN 5, ARCHITECTEN CIE
CLIENT/DEVELOPER: WESTERKAAP 1 & 2: HOFMAKERIJ; VOC COUR: WODAN; LA GRANDE COUR: CITY COUR COMBINATION
DATE OF COMPLETION: 2007-2009
STATUS: COMPLETED
PROJECT FEATURES

LOCATION TYPE    REDEVELOPMENT / FUNCTION CHANGE
LOCATION SIZE    46,000 m², 560m x 120m
SCALE LEVEL      TRANSITION CITY-BUILDING
URBANITY          MEDIUM - HIGH
MAIN THEMES       DWELLING DIVERSITY, COLLECTIVE SPACE
The closed building blocks are a coherent typology in the center of Amsterdam. The sizes of the blocks in the morphology of the city are quite large. By breaking up the large blocks in smaller parts they created high quality communal courtyards.

1:7500
Other than the morphology, the water really ties this area to the city. The water gives the island large amounts of visual open space as a counter to the dense development of the island.
The whole of the area is accessible via the main road connecting central station to the east side of Amsterdam. Pedestrians and cyclists also have direct access to the backside (water front) of the location.

Access

The whole of the area is accessible via the main road connecting central station to the east side of Amsterdam. Pedestrians and cyclists also have direct access to the backside (water front) of the location.
Important public places that have means to stay there, such as seats, but also have commercial facilities to make a stay more attractive. On the Westerdokseiland there is only one public space available where these characteristics are found.

1:7500
**Relation to the City**

As it is an island there is lots of visual open space from which the icons of the city are visible, such as the church towers and the railroad overpass.

1:5000
Panoramic view
Traffic
The island is connected via one main road that passes the building blocks at the front. The back of the island is accessible via three narrow roads.
Main road

Secondary road
Access to the plinth functions are located around the blocks. The main entrances of the apartment blocks are located at the front and back, while entrances to the ground bound dwellings are located at the smaller side streets.
Public space is restricted to a square at the east of the island and the boulevard on the south. The building blocks are focussed on the communal space inside the blocks, rather then public space outside of them.
Public square

Public boulevard
As mentioned before the building blocks are focused on the internal green communal spaces. The only other green space on the island is a tree lined boulevard.
1. Green collective inner courtyards

2. Public Boulevard
Parking

All residents are obliged to buy a underground parking space. The outside parking spaces are there for visitors of residents and commercial facilities.
1. **Underground Parking Entrance La Grande Cour**

2. **Street Parking Along Boulevard**
Building levels
The project characterizes itself by creating a commercial plinth with towers on top. It has various building levels, this has created a dynamic roofscape. As a whole
Figures

**Total Site Area** 50,000m²

**Footprint Built** 19,600m²

**Total Built Area (incl. parking)** 150,000m²

**Floor Space Index** 3.0

**Ground Space Index** 0.4

**Open Space Ratio** 0.1
The program is very one-sided. The development consists mainly of apartments with a few additional functions on the ground floor. The offices are situated along the main road on the front, while the cultural functions and commercial functions are at the back at the water.
La Grande Cour is part of Westerdokseiland. The dwellings are organized around three courtyards. Large openings ensure that most dwellings have views on the courtyards, thereby making it possible to deliver pleasant dwellings despite the high density (300 dwellings per hectare). For the same reason, the tall buildings in the spatial masterplan were designed as ‘periscopes’ that cantilever above the perimeter buildings to focus on the panoramic views. There is a great variety of dwelling types in several categories, from subsidized rental to upmarket owner-occupied dwellings.

The architecture of the block was designed by three different architectural practices, MVSA, Heren 5 and de Architekten Cie. Each plan area includes a courtyard and it is here that the individual architectural styles are most in evidence. External architectural unity was achieved through continuous consultation during the planning process. The architects also consulted on the internal layout and circulation, with the result that some external walkways and corridors continue through the three different wings.

-MVSA-

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN:** Meyer en van Schooten Architecten, Heren 5, Architecten CIE  
**CLIENT/DEVELOPER:** City Cour Combination  
**DATE OF COMPLETION:** 2007  
**STATUS:** Completed
PROJECT FEATURES

TYPOLOGY  CLOSED BUILDING BLOCK, WITH COURTYARDS
LOCATION SIZE  8,000 m², 100m x 80m
BUILDING SIZE  37,600 m²
URBANITY  HIGH
PROGRAM  OFFICES, APARTMENTS, COMMERCIAL
HOUSING TYPOLOGY  SINGLE STORY AND DUPLEXES
The commercial functions are located along the main road and at the public square to the south of the building. The communal apartment entrances are located along the main road and the boulevard, while the ground bound dwelling entrances are located along the calmer secondary road.

Access

1:1000
ACCESS

PUBLIC SPACE

PARKING

DENSITY

DIVERSITY

1. Communal entrances apartments & courtyards

2. Access to ground bound dwellings
There are several main cores that provide main access. Duplex apartments are situated along a corridor that provides access for 3 floors at a time. On the south side of the plan there are galleries that provide the access to the single story apartments. Most access is through the courtyards.
XX NUMBER OF STORIES

BUILDING LEVELS

The building has a three story plinth, on which apartment towers are built upon. A special feature are the three cantilevered periscope apartment blocks.
Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area</td>
<td>8,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footprint built</td>
<td>7,900m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total built area (exl. parking)</td>
<td>37,600m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Program**

The development consists mainly of apartments with a few additional functions on the ground floor. The offices are situated along the main road on the front, while the other functions are at the back at the water. Parking is a large portion of the whole development.
There are four types of apartments, ranging from a one bedroom to a four bedroom apartment. Within this size range, there are also various shapes of the type of apartments from single story to duplexes.
In this section it is clearly visible that housing is the main portion of the development. The commercial and office functions are located in the plinth, at the main road and boulevard.
Program diversity

The commercial functions have additional height and are located at the square. In this section, the periscopes are clearly visible in section as well as in elevation.

1:750
The KNSM Island is a man-made island in the Eastern Docklands of Amsterdam. It is named for the Koninklijke Nederlandse Stoomboot-Maatschappij (KNSM), the Royal Dutch Steamboat Shipping company which used to have its headquarters and its docks on the island. It is now a large residential area containing modern architecture with a mostly well-off population.

In the 1990s the entire area was reshaped into a housing area, based on a 1988 blueprint by Jo Coenen, his first big project. He envisioned a mixed use of the space, and planned “super blocks”, along an off center main avenue, mimicking the organization of the island’s former warehouses and storage buildings.

Many of the old buildings on the KNSM Island were preserved by order of the city.

**General Information**

**Urban Design:** Jo Coenen
**Architectural Design:** Various architects, a.o.: Jo Coenen, Wiel Arets, Bruno Albert, Diener & Diener, Villanova
**Client/Developer:** Various, a.o.: housing association De Doelen, Wilma Bouw, housing association Het Oosten
**Date of Completion:** 1997
**Status:** Completed
PROJECT FEATURES

LOCATION TYPE: REDEVELOPMENT / FUNCTION CHANGE
LOCATION SIZE: 118,200 m², 780m x 150m
SCALE LEVEL: TRANSITION CITY-BUILDING
URBANITY: MEDIUM - LOW
MAIN THEMES: HISTORICAL INDUSTRIAL BACKGROUND, GREEN SPACES
The large building blocks refer to the old industrial background of the island. This can be well seen by the two big super blocks at the southern waterfront of the island.
Other than the morphology, the water really ties this area to the city. The water gives the island large amounts of visual open space. It creates clear views to Borneo, Sporenburg and the Oostelijke Handelskade.
The island is a destination as there is only one way in and out and because it is in a relative remote corner of Amsterdam. It is well accessible by foot, bicycle, car and public transportation.
The public space has received much attention as there is a fountain, a pond, a children's play area, a basketball/football court, long strips of green to walk your dog and two boulevards at the south and north end of the island.
As it is an island, there is lots of visual open space from which the icons of the city are visible, such as the whale on Borneo Island and the Oostelijke Handelskade.
Panoramic view
The island has one side from which all access to and from the island is organized. There is one main road through the island to which secondary roads are connected. The northern boulevard is only accessible for cyclists and pedestrians, while the southern boulevard is also for cars.

1:3500
Traffic

PUBLIC SPACE

DENSITY

DIVERSITY

ACCESS

PARKING

1
Main road

2
Secondary road
Most entrances are located at the main road and the southern boulevard. The commercial entrances are mainly at the beginning of the island.
Mixed apartment and commercial entrances

Apartment entrances
There is relatively much public space available on the island. Even the super blocks are porous in that public space flows through them.
1. Football/Basketball Court

2. Public accessible courtyard in Barcelona building
Much attention has been paid to both the public and collective green area’s throughout the whole KNSM island. The large amounts of green spaces characterize this project and make it very attractive.
1. Collective courtyard

2. Public green strip along the main road
In the design, much attention has also been paid to facilitate cars in the area. Whether along the main road or underneath the building blocks.
1. Underground parking entrance

2. Outside parking along the main road
Most buildings have between six to nine stories. There is one exception, which is the 21 story Skydome by Wiel Arets.
### Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Area</td>
<td>118,200 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footprint Built</td>
<td>39,000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Built Area (incl. Parking)</td>
<td>206,700 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Space Index</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Space Index</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Ratio</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program

The newly developed buildings mainly consist of apartments. The old industrial buildings have been turned into social, commercial and office space. These spaces are mainly located at the beginning of the island.
This block of is one of the three large blocks in the plan of Coenen for the KNSM island. The complex is built around an old industrial building. Around it is a public route from the KNSM avenue to the water. The building has two courtyards. Of which in the west wall, a hole is supported by 96 columns. This gives the residents at the courtyard a view of the small park located next to the block by Mien Ruys, a famous Dutch landscape architect. The other courtyard is only visible from the homes that surround it.

The apartment building has 304 apartments divided over 150 modifications of two dwelling types of which 95 percent is in the social rented sector. In addition there are several commercial units and a parking garage under the building with 106 places.

The building has both porch as gallery apartment access. The materialization consists of mainly dark brick walls. Furthermore, the horizontal pivoting windows are a striking element in the facades.

**General Information**

**Architectural Design:**
Hans Kollhof en Christian Rapp

**Client/Developer:**
Housing Corporation De Doelen

**Date of Completion:**
1994

**Status:**
Completed
PROJECT FEATURES

TYPOLOGY
HALF CLOSED BUILDING BLOCK, WITH INACCESSIBLE COURTYARDS

LOCATION SIZE
8,800 m², 170m x 60m

BUILDING SIZE
43,000 m²

URBANITY
HIGH

PROGRAM
OFFICES, APARTMENTS, COMMERCIAL

HOUSING TYPOLOGY
SINGLE STORY AND DUPLEXES
All apartment entrances are located all around the building block. The southern entrances serve both the commercial functions as well as the apartments.
1. **MAIN APARTMENT ACCES FROM THE MAIN ROAD**

2. **PUBLIC COURTYARD APARTMENT ACCES**
Circulation

The access is based on the fact that a typical core provides access for two apartments per floor. At the top are duplexes because of the slanting roofs. There are also galeries.
The nine story high north and eastern sides of the building form a strong wall to the north side of the island. The south side is lower for better views of the water and better natural daylighting.
Figures

Total site area
footprint built
total built area (exl. parking) 9.600m² 6.100m² 43.000m²
Floor Space Index
Ground Space Index
Open Space Ratio 4.5 0.6 0.1
The program is like the overall program of the island, housing orientated. The development consists mainly of apartments with a few additional functions on the ground floor. It is clear that the backside is the main side, by having multiple different functions at the water.
There are two main single story dwelling types from which all dwellings are deviated. These are the two and three bedroom apartments. The top level apartments are mostly duplex variations of these types. The four and five bedroom apartments are located in the corners of the block.
Program Diversity
The section shows the sloping of the roof to the south with duplex apartments at the top levels. The commercial functions are located at the southern water front.
Program diversity

As in the previous section, this one shows the sloping of the roof very clearly with double high and duplex apartments. It also shows a relation to the main street and with the skydome building.
COMPARATIVE CONCLUSIONS
The footprints of the buildings on the islands in relation to the existing city are in essence comparable. Yet the city blocks are comprised of many smaller units, while the new islands are rather bulky in comparison.

Water is a real connecting factor between these islands and the city. This visual open space really gives all islands breathing space that inner city projects have less of. The open water also gives space for wide views.

All islands are well accessible, both by foot, bicycle, car and public transportation. Though where Oosterdokseiland and Westerdokseiland are accessible from various sides, KNSM is only from one side.
Public facilitated spaces on the islands are addressed in different ways, with different levels of importance. Yet all have narrow boulevards along the water.

These urban sections really show the difference in density in these projects. The relation with the city is also clearly visible. From church towers in the city center to apartment towers in the Eastern Docklands.
All islands work with one main access road in and out. Oosterdokseiland and KNSM both have places for pedestrians only, while Westerdokseiland is focussed on the inside of the buildings.

The entrances to public functions (office and commercial) are in all cases located where the majority of the people pass by. While the dwelling entrances are located at the secondary streets.

The amount of publicly accessible outdoor space varies quite a lot per island. But whereas KNSM island has lots of visible open space, it is hardly activated by functions as much as is done at Oosterdokseiland, where the spaces will work very differently.
Though Oosterdokseiland’s emphasis on public space, it does not have a lot of green. Though Westerdokseiland has communal green in its courtyards, KNSM really is an oasis by comparison, attracting different inhabitants.

Parking on all islands is partially to fully done underground in one or many smaller parking garages.

The density of the islands varies quite a lot, with very different impacts on the public, private and communal environments created there.
The diversity in program are quite similar between Westerdokseiland and KNSM, with mostly housing and a plinth with some additional commercial functions in it. Westerdokseiland is more a reflection of the existing city, and does therefore also generate more of an active public inner city attractive environment.
The commercial entrances are clearly located where the people pass by along the public spaces. Interesting about Pireaus is that the apartments share their entrances with commercial functions at the south side.

Circulation in the buildings is done in various ways. There are cores directly connecting to apartments, corridor access, gallery access, and inner circulation in duplex apartments. The projects use a mixture of these.

The projects are very dense. The courtyards in Plot 2 and Pireaus are used to only get visual space, while the density of La Grande Cour can also be experience from within the communal courtyards.
BUILDING

The programs really reflect what the ideas of the island are. And while Plot 2 has a greater mixture of functions, they are completely separated.

The dwelling diversity throughout the buildings is varied. It is clearly visible that the larger types are better off at the sides than to mix them in the building. Also there no clear connection between the percentages.

The sections show the program diversity and the way the buildings are layered and the relation of open spaces within the blocks to the built mass. It shows that though La Grande Cour is dense, it is also very open.
OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

To make this comparative conclusion complete we’ve made a small list of main issues that stand out strongly within the research analysis of the Oosterdokseiland, Westerdokseiland and KNSM-eiland. One special remark already can be given: all three locations show great similarities in size, program and organization which made the comparison quite precise.

1: The organization of the traffic flow going in and out the island is very carefully solved. Most of the times there is a separate route for pedestrians and cyclist.

2: Because all locations are redevelopments/transformation the buildings have a special engagement with the surrounding areas. This can be seen in great public spaces alongside the waterfronts as well in the use of balconies and large window frames on building level.

3: All the building blocks make use of inner courtyards. This has two advantages, one you create space for daylight to enter the dwellings and two (this is particularly true for the building blocks on the Westerdokseiland) if big enough design the courtyard can be used as a quiet and secure playing ground for children faraway from dangerous traffic and other possible hazards.

4: The diversity in program shows that it creates an area that is attractive and lively.

5: The restriction of the car is most strongly seen in the Oosterdokseiland, here the car has to act more as a guest in a pedestrian area. This is obviously because of the seriously limited amount of space that is still open and available on the island. From KNSM-eiland it is actually the opposite the car claims much more space and attention.

6: The amount of different dwelling types that is incorporated in the building blocks is enormous. Especially for Westerdokseiland and KNSM-eiland since these two islands are more focused towards the residential side of the program. Of course a comparison is always a difficulty job because so often the project are too different from each other to make a good comparison with comparable material. That is also why we’ve chosen to take three big urban plans and within those three plans one special building. In this manner we create a great variety in scale level and depth which only contributes to the quality of the analysis.
ESSAYS
William H. Whyte once said, "It is difficult to design a space that will not attract people – what is remarkable is how often this has been accomplished". Today, many public spaces seem to be intentionally designed to be looked at but not touched. They are neat, clean, and empty – as if to say, "no people, no problem!" But to us, when a public space is empty, vandalized, or used chiefly by undesirables, this is generally an indication that something very wrong with its design, or its management, or both" (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.-d).

All over the world, many obsolete industrial areas and empty spaces in cities are being transformed in order to densify the existing urban fabrics. Examples are the Docklands in London, Oosterdokseiland in Amsterdam, Barangaroo in Sydney, Hafencity in Hamburg, Diagonal Mar in Barcelona and many more. Here, often non-public areas make room for mixed use high density developments, and public accessible outdoor space is being created where it did not exist before. The Zuidas is one of many of these new high density type developments in Amsterdam.

According to the Vision brochure for the Zuidas, this new international business district will become the second city center of Amsterdam, with the train station becoming Amsterdam’s primary station (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2009, p49). The intentions of the designer of the Zuidas are good: wanting to create an urban landscape that can generate an authentic urban fabric of human encounters, along with the added value that these encounters entail. This means that outdoor space must be more than just circulation area (Bruijn, 2011, p40-41).

Indeed between the existing tall buildings, rising up to 100 meters, a new urban public terrain has appeared from the sports fields that were once there. And while the Zuidas is still only about one sixth of its proposed size, the way the public outdoor space works now is static and not inviting to use, compared to other high density redevelopment areas in Amsterdam and the world. The spaces are too big, too open, too windy and too dark to be attractive, and they are not activated with public or commercial functions that invite people to use it. Instead they have become harsh stone zones where people store their bicycles. It does not attract a varied crowd via a diversity of functions, like a city center does.

In the end though, the vision calls for a roughly equal split between housing, shops, facilities and offices in an area 1.5 to 3 times as dense, which will increase the urban center potential of the area (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2009, p68).
Michael van Gessel, supervisor of the IJ banks in Amsterdam, explains that urbanism is all about the space in which we all live together: public outdoor space. Buildings are of course a necessary part of that with their functions, yet between them is where community life takes place (Vlek, 12m35s).

Stephen Carr (who wrote the book Public Space and Needs in Public Space) concurs with Jan Gehl (Cities for People) and William Whyte (The Social Life of Small Urban Places) that public outdoor space is a vital part of our cities. Gehl and Whyte are part of New York based organization Project for Public Spaces (PPS). They are actively involved in improving outdoor spaces in cities all over the world. “We all realize that a “sense of place” is of fundamental value to people everywhere — in every city, every town, every neighborhood, and every culture, for all ages” (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.-b).

Rudy Uytenhaak (Cities Full of Space: Qualities of Density, and Beautifully Compact NL), Le Corbusier (The City of Tomorrow) and Alex Lehnerer (Grand Urban Rules) have researched the effects of density on public space. According to Uytenhaak it is apparent that densely built areas cause an automatic loss of (natural) qualities (Uytenhaak, 2008, p8).

“The focus in urbanism needs to shift from a process focused on the production of number of houses to a process where the central focus is on urban elements within a well working environment. In particular the public interest needs to be well served in of high quality public spaces, facilities, transportation/infrastructure and landscape design” (Uytenhaak and Beyer, 2010, p65).

The core of the issue
The main question is then how public outdoor space works and what the good or bad quantifiable characteristics of outdoor space are, in order to generate design parameters. This has to be seen in reference to the impact of high density on this open space, as this is the current task at hand in many cities around the world today.

In the Zuidas the new space is going to up to 3 times as dense as Amsterdam’s city center. And while density brings along more people to use the newly created city space, it does not therefore automatically develop city life (Gehl, 2010, p68). Yet densification (of the city as a whole) can actually help improve urban outdoor space, considering both its quantity and quality in the current redeveloping cities.

Why outdoor city spaces are important
Active public spaces enrich public life in cities. They act as breathing spaces where people may relax or simply enjoy being in an urban setting and absorb the everyday life surrounding them (Fernando, 2007, p54).

“A city should be busy and full of people, with functions and movements and yet despite its density and fullness not feel cramped. Public open spaces are therefore an urban necessity” (Uytenhaak, 2008, p14).

Carr mentions five types of people’s need for public space: in it people can experience comfort, relax, engage both passively and actively with the environment, and discover other things and other people (Carr et al., 1992 [2007], p231). This public life in urban outdoor spaces is something good for both people and the societies and cities in which we all live (Carr et al., 1992, p43-44). These public spaces should (when they are designed with the needs of people in mind) encourage...
a diversity of urban experiences. It should encourage activities from daydreaming to sports, eating, sunbathing, strolling and snoozing. People can talk, sit, look, relax, play, stroll, flirt, eat, drink, smoke, peoplewatch, read, soak in sunshine and feel part of a broader whole. Open outdoor spaces are the starting point for all community (Walljasper, 2005). In these spaces views of green and water are very important for the well-being of the people who live in cities. One tree in the city might be as important as 100ha in a forest (Uytenhaak and Beyer, 2010, p171).

“Open spaces serve both as a spatial counterpart to the adjacent existing built volumes and as typological counterpart of the free open spaces in the countryside. Research has shown time and again that these urban, green spaces are often highly valued, sometimes even higher than the natural countryside. The less distinctly designed leftover spaces in post-war areas are far less appreciated” (Uytenhaak and Beyer, 2010, p37).

Attention to space Comparing urban open spaces in the Zuidas to Rockefeller Center, or Herald Square in New York, different aspects can be seen. These various aspects of public open spaces can be measured, analysed and compared to be able to make claims on how good or bad these spaces function. William Whyte was one of the first people to study these types of places by using time lapse cameras to document the behaviour of people in urban open places. He notes: “What attracts people most, it would appear, is other people. … Yet how many people would say they like to sit in the middle of a crowd? Instead, they speak of getting away from it all, and use terms like ‘escape’, ‘oasis’, ‘retreat’. What people do, however, reveals a different priority” (Whyte, 1980, p19).

Whyte also mentions people’s choice in public places for where they want to be. They do not want to just sit comfortably, but especially to sit socially comfortable. They want a choice to sit in groups or alone, in the sun, in the shade or to the side somewhere (Whyte, 1980, p28). Amanda Burden of the New York urban planning department, affirms that there should be multiple kinds of seating, like movable chairs: people will move them just a little to make it ‘their chair, and their place’ and let you decide where and with whom to sit (Hustwitt, 22min).

The way urban open spaces are designed has a big impact on the way, the frequency and the duration with which people use the public spaces around them. The impact of city space is indeed not derived from its quantity, but its usable quality, together with how long people stay (Gehl, 2010, p69).

These spaces should be visually and environmentally varied and attractive. Contrasts should be strived for between city and nature, dynamics and intimacy, full and relaxed spaces, great and small, low and high, old and new, private and public, hard and soft and rest and bustle (Uytenhaak and Beyer, 2010, p51).

Both Uytenhaak and van Gessel make it plain that the public domain needs to get special attention in urban areas. PPS goes even further with Placemaking. New high density redevelopments in a city need to actually be designed around public space. This is not left over space, put in as a compensating good will gesture; but intentional, inviting, beautiful and practical urban public space that is well connected to its surroundings. We should not treat any project as a means to create a great design, but a great place. Cities should be place centered instead of solely building centered. (Project
Aspects of success and failure

In the Project for Public Spaces, Whyte and Gehl and others have combined their research into a list of quantifiable points with which to grade these spaces.

Eight reasons why public spaces fail:
• Poor entrances and visually inaccessible spaces
• Paths that don’t go where people want to go to
• Lack of gathering points
• Domination of a space by vehicles
• Blank walls or dead zones around the edges of a place
• Dysfunctional features
• Lack of places to sit
• Inconveniently located transit stops

Sometimes public spaces might be hidden from the main road. People need to see it is there for them to be attracted to it. And while these spaces are often too large to be inviting, too small is not good either. Additionally, cars kill the quality of attractive urban space and are detrimental to pedestrian safety.

The Rockefeller Center in New York had a people problem. Visitors were getting on the planted areas, which the managers of the center did not want, because of which they were sending people away. The area was close to becoming privatized until the PPS suggested placing benches there for people to sit on. Now this place has become a great example of how to transform an urban space for the better with simple measures to meet people’s needs.

Public transportation and park and ride opportunities are valuable in combination with urban public spaces as it facilitates use of the spaces, but also reverse as these spaces stimulate the use of public transportation (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.-d).

The Symphonie squares (at the Symphonie towers in the Zuidas) are a practical example of how places do not work at all as attractive urban outdoor spaces. The South square (Gershwin square) at the water has good direct daylight, yet is at the bottom of two isolated 100m towers, making it very windy. It is an empty large square (75 by 65m), flat, completely paved with no green differentiation at all, with only a couple of benches at a side. The front square however has a few pots with trees and seating, but is covered in the towers shade all day long. Also, the busyness due to its location along the main road further prevents it from being used.

In contrast, four successful aspects of public urban spaces are:
• Sociability
• Uses and activities
• Access and linkages
• Comfort and image

Public urban spaces should then be diverse, neighbourly, friendly, interactive and welcoming. As well as fun, they need to be useful and provide the possibility to be active. In an urban environment proximity to other parts of town and connections to other important places, parking and public transport are important aspects. If the space is far from everything less people will use it.

Pioneer Courthouse Square in Portland is an example of great urban outdoor space. Image: PPS
Therefore, high density places have an advantage in this area. Socially they need to be safe (have good clear views around, with no fast traffic), be walkable, sittable and attractive (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.-c).

According to PPS, the Pioneer Courthouse Square in Portland is one of the better existing public spaces out there as it includes the good qualities and avoids the bad aspects of urban public outdoor space. It varies in height, has different places to sit, offers things to do and to eat, is easily accessible by public transport and provides views of water and green. Bryant Park & Herald Square in New York are also great examples of how urban outdoor space works. Like most places in New York they have flexible seating and tables as a prime attractive asset. As their context is a stone city, their (small) green flexible aspects make them very attractive in a very dense urban area.

The Seagram building in New York is an example of an unexpectedly well functioning public space. It shows that people might use a space in ways designers might never imagine it. Mies van der Rohe was quite surprised when he saw people sitting on the ledges of the building, as he never dreamt they would (Kayden, 2000, p11).

The impact of high density on outdoor space

Increasing the density in a city usually means reducing private and public outdoor space in order to build higher and closer together, leaving less space on the ground level. Obvious impacts are also the fact that the higher buildings get, reduced sunlight to street level and wind nuisance come into play. Also the feeling of enclosure is felt as there is less open space. Though the connection with, and views of the city get better and more diverse. According to Uytenhaak, urban outdoor space is something that requires extra attention when dealing with high density developments. “Density should not be at the expense of the joy of living. Actually, the quality of housing and the surrounding public space should actually compensate for the density achieved” (Uytenhaak, 2008, p35). The following two examples are different ways of dealing with urban open space in relation to densification.

1. New York

In New York in 1916 a zoning law was initiated to make sure the streets would not become too dark as a result of all the high-rise buildings. It resulted in buildings that had a stepped façade, set back from the street by several floors at a time to get more light into the streets. Yet the whole of the plots were still being built on, and public space was still limited. The new Bonus Rule Resolution of 1961 was meant to increase the very scarce quality public space available in the city. It meant that the developer would give back part of the plot as public space to the city (the plaza), while adding an additional allowance of building height in return, creating the New York signature flush glass facades (Lehnerer, 2009, p177-178). The city did not however specify ‘usable’ as distinct from space meant to bring more light and air to street level (Kayden, 2000, p11). These privately
Owned public spaces were often thus of questionable quality and often did not work as intended by the city. This little patch of space was then often just a very poor quality gesture from the developer to be able to build a taller skyscraper, not addressing the needs of people at all (Carr et al., 1992 [2007], p230).

2. Paris

Good examples of poor and impoverished outdoor spaces are the post war developments in Europe. The relation between the built environment and the numerous scattered outdoor spaces is often not taken into account as there is no direct connection for people to use them.

It can be better seen as water: unused breathing space between huge buildings.

Within this concept, Le Corbusier saw densification as liberation of urban outdoor space. He saw the horrific scenes of the centre of Paris, with its seven story high buildings and narrow seven to nine meter wide streets with only 15-20% open space. He also saw the unorganized hustle and bustle of the business district and high rises of New York’s downtown for example as complete horrors (Corbusier, 1947, p173 & 288). In response to this, he proposed his plan Voisin as an sixfold intensification of the center of Paris with multiple copies of identical high rise towers, while creating 95% open space (Corbusier, 1947, p172 & 284-289). His ideas were copied in several places, such as very successfully at Stuyvesant Town in east Manhattan.

But while buildings get taller in order to increase in density, Gehl states that roughly only the first five floors of the buildings relate to the outdoor space below. These lower floors provide visual relation with the city space and going outside is not yet considered as too long and difficult (Gehl, 2010, p68).

“It is widely believed that the lively city needs high building density and large concentrations of dwellings and workplaces. But what the lively city really needs is a combination of good inviting city space and a certain critical mass of people who want to use it. There are countless examples of places with high building density and poor city spaces that do not work at all. New urban areas are often dense and fully developed, but their city spaces are too numerous, too big and too impoverished to inspire anyone to venture into them. In fact, we often see that poorly planned high density actually obstructs the establishment of good city space, thus quenching life in the city” (Gehl, 2010, p68).

Conclusion

The Zuidas has good intentions in wanting to become a lively vibrant second city center. What we see in reality however is a lack of attractive urban public space where this might happen. The architects building in the Zuidas focus only on their individual building, designing icon islands which are turned into themselves as gated communities.

Outdoor public space has quantifiable characteristics that can be taken into account as design parameters for any project. Through looking at projects and comparing them, Project for Public Spaces has
Come with a design guide with things to be certain to include, and things to be sure to avoid. According to them, design will determine whether a public outdoor place will work or not. Yet they do admit that the space is flexible. It is never finished; it is a continuous process where people’s influence and preference do matter. It should grow with the people and be community based.

One size does not fit all uses. Variety and contrast are the key words in designing public space. Height, size, density, green, water, types of seating, activities, rest and bustle; a space should facilitate and stimulate interaction and lingering in the area to create a vibrant lively city that people love living in.

High density has a big impact on outdoor space. Reduced daylight, increased wind and an enclosed feeling are direct possible results. In New York density took away much of the daylight and public space on street level. But these days it often means the opposite: designers put in too much open space as a compensation for the higher achieved density. Yet these are often (just like with post war developments) left over undesigned spaces where nobody wants to stay in.

The presence of many people because of high density does not necessarily create active outdoor city life. It needs to be facilitated for it to organically grow as people attract people.

High quality public outdoor spaces are important in high density urban settings. They compensate the loss of natural qualities. When we look at New York for example, many good examples can be seen where density and outdoor space are bound together to create a better whole. The higher the density, the more challenging and important the task becomes of creating quality outdoor space to compensate for the lack of open space in which we live.

By focusing on Placemaking (building places around intentional quality outdoor spaces), new high density urban redevelopments can be a major improvement to many urban landscapes where public spaces are actually often leftover spaces. In knowing the qualities and drawbacks of high density developments, designing it to be a place can become one of the greatest values to the future of our current redeveloping cities’ ever growing needs.
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Wie vandaag de dag een supermarkt binnenloopt om koffie te kopen, zal worden overweldigd door de aanblik van het schap. Zo liggen er talloze verschillende merken, smaken, soorten, vormen, kleuren, prijzen en aanbiedingen. Maar niet alleen in de supermarkt is er tegenwoordig meer keuze, ook op vele andere vlakken (studierichting, vrijetijdsbesteding, goede doelen, financiële producten) kan er gekozen worden uit verschillende producten of diensten. De rede hiervoor zou liggen in het feit dat wij steeds individueel ingesteld zijn. We hebben de behoefte om te laten zien wie we zijn en waar we voor staan. Want geen mens is hetzelfde, iedereen heeft andere voorkeuren, smaak en interesses. In ieder geval is dat waar wij in geloven en hoe we communiceren. Websites zoals Facebook, Youtube en LinkedIn zijn grote sociale netwerken die hier uitermate geschikt voor zijn. De stelling van Ivan Bercedo in het tijdschrift Quaderns #227, dat we van een enkele culturele identiteit met een sterk gevoel voor het ‘wij’ opgeschoven zijn naar meerdere culturele identiteiten met een sterk gevoel voor de ‘ik’, klinkt dan ook geloofwaardig.\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^3\) Toch kennen de vele voordelen van de individualisering ook een keerzijde. Natuurlijk, de eens zo eenvoudige taak om in een supermarkt een pak koffie te kopen is lastiger geworden, maar de werkelijke keerzijde bevindt zich op sociaal vlak. Alle moeilijkheden die we tegenkomen krijgen via internet en mobiele technologieën beïnvloeden de oorspronkelijke sociale samenhang van de samenleving. Zo vreest Ray Oldenburg in zijn boek ‘Great Good Places’ voor vereenzaming en fragmentatie door het gebruik van internet. Mensen zouden zich steeds vaker isoleren van anderen en zich terugtrekken uit openbare plekken, waar nu juist het gemeenschapsleven ontstaat.\(^2\) Mensen hoeven hun huis niet meer uit om activiteiten te ondernemen waarvoor ze ‘vroeger’ het openbare leven moesten betreden, zoals werken, winkelen of ontspanning. Zodat dit effect niet alleen invloed heeft op de samenleving, maar ook op de stad zelf. Volgens Georges Teyssot leven we vanaf nu niet meer in een stad die opgebouwd is rondassen en met een hiërarchie van stedelijke ruimtes. We bewegen op een kaart, waarmee we het tijdperk van ‘determinisering’ zijn ingegaan.\(^3\) Ook Harm Tilman deelt een dergelijke veronderstelling:

“Communicatie en informatie-technologieën vergroten de modaliteit van deze spectrale relaties. Nieuwe leefstijlen en nieuwe vormen van stedelijkheid zijn het resultaat van deze technologieën. Ze bevorderen de
ONTBINDING VAN DE MATERIËLE STAD IN EEN GEFRAGMENTEERD GEHEEL VAN TERMINALS DIE DOOR KABELS EN KABELNETWERKEN MET ELKAAR WORDEN VERBONDEN: DE TELEFOON, DE KOELKAST, DE PERSONAL COMPUTER.

NAAST BOVENGENOEMDE OPMERKINGEN DIE EEN ENIGSZINS NEGATIEVE C.Q. CONSERVATIEVE HOUDING BEVATTEN, ZIJN ER TEGENWOORDIG OOK STEEDS MEER POSITIEVE EN PROGRESSIEVE GELUIDEN TE HOREN. DEZE STELLEN JUIST DAT DE KOMST VAN INTERNET ONS SOCIALE LEVEN HEeft VERRIJKT.

DE TREND VAN INDIVIDUALISERING BLIJKT DUS VEELOMVATTENDER TE ZIJN DAN DEZE IN EERSTE INSTANTIE LIJKT. MEDE HIERDOR MAG AANGENOMEN WORDEN DAT HET OOK ZIJN WEG HEEFT GEVONDEN BINNEN DE MASSAWONINGBOUW. RECENTE ONTWIKKELINGEN ZOALS DE ZELFBOUWONING EN DE URBANE ENCLAVE, KUNNEN DAN OOK GEZIEN WORDEN ALS PRODUCTEN VAN DE INDIVIDUALISERENDE SAMENLEVING. MAAR HOE IS HET MOGELIJK DAT TWEE TOTAAL CHATTEL ANDERE Woonvormen ONTSTAAN BINNEN EÉN SOCIAAL MAATSCAPPELIJKE TREND? WAT WE ONS EIGENLIJK AFRAGEN IS HOE EEN ONTWERPEN STRUCTUUR VAN DE STAD IN RELATIE STAAT TOT DE SOCIALE CONFIGURATIES VAN DE SAMENLEVING.

In dit specifieke voorbeeld wordt de wisselwerking bekeken tussen zelfbouwondingen, urbane enclaves en de individualiserende samenleving. Om hierop antwoord te vinden, wordt kort de geschiedenis van de massawoningbouw aangehaald. Vervolgens worden twee recente ontwikkelingen, de zelfbouwoning en de urbane enclave, tegen het licht gehouden vanuit het perspectief van de individualisering.

MASSAWONINGBOUW EEN TERUGBLIK
Het artikel ‘Massa en woningbouw, een historisch perspectief’ van Willem Sulters uit de Oase 37/38 1994, vormt de basis voor het onderstaande stuk dat de geschiedenis van massawoningbouw kort weergeeft. We beginnen de geschiedenis in de jaren zestig van de vorige eeuw, het tijdperk van grote en ingrijpende bouwplannen. Destijds bestond nog sterk het idee dat het mogelijk was om door middel van een fysiek ontwerp bewoners te ‘heropvoeden’.

Het werk van Bakema en Stam-Beese uit de groep Opbouw is hiervoor exemplarisch. Impliciet schuilde hierin het psychologisch axioma ten aanzien van de verschijningsvorm van de architectuur. De architectuur zou werkelijk in staat zijn het sociaal bewustzijn van de waarnemer te beïnvloeden en zo bij te dragen aan de totstandkoming van het samenlevingsideaal.

Maar wat er eigenlijk gebeurde was dat de architecten, planologen en politici de architectuur van de stad reduceerden tot een politiek en economisch product. Erg belangrijk in deze plannen waren de organisatie van bevolkingsmobiliteit en infrastructuur. De gerationaliseerde planningsmethode ging samen met grootschalige, geïndustrialiseerde systeembouw. Kortom de stadsbewoner werd genummerd en verzorgd. Een goed voorbeeld van deze architectuur en sociale opvattingen is de Bijlmermeer. De Bijlmermeer van net na haar voltooiing wel te verstaan, want snel na de oplevering bleek het plan niet te werken en werden er diverse aanpassingen doorgevoerd. In de jaren zeventig dwong de
ANONIEME GEBRUIKER INVLOED AF IN HET PROCES VAN STADSPLANNING EN -ONTWERP.

“DE KARAKTERISTIEKE ‘STEDELIJKHEID’ VAN DE BESTAANDE HISTORISCHE STAD WERD OPIEUWALSUITGANGSPUNT GESTELD IN DE STADSVERNIEUWINGSOPERATIES. DE STADSBEWONER KREEG EEN STEM: INSPRAAK.”

Vervolgens zien we in de jaren tachtig dat volkshuisvesting en massawoningbouw steeds meer een product van marktmechanismen wordt. Vraag en aanbod bepalen sterk de prijs en er bestaat de sociaal bepaalde wens om zich te kunnen onderscheiden van datgene wat algemeen gevraagd is. De opkomst van commercieel lucratieve en ‘exclusieve’ architectuur is geboren, de stadsbewoner werd een consument. De jaren negentig kenmerken zich door het einde van de grote stadsuitbreidingen en maakte plaats voor het beheer van de stad. Het klinkt misschien tegenstrijdig, maar de Vinex-locaties vallen daar ook onder. Er werd vanuit de overheid gestuurd om specifieke plaatsen die ongebreidelde groei of dreigende krimp tegen diende te gaan. Bekende voorbeelden hiervan zijn Leidsche Rijn en IJburg.

ZELFBOUWKAVELS ALS OPLOSSING VOOR DE INDIVIDUALISERENDE SAMENLEVING

Terugkijkende op de geschiedenis van de massawoningbouw kan vastgesteld worden dat er een behoorlijke ontwikkeling heeft plaatsgevonden, die grotendeels veroorzaakt is door de bewoners. In het eerste stadium hadden architecten, planologen en politici veel invloed en macht op de bevolking. Dit volgt de sociaal maatschappelijke verhoudingen uit die tijd waarbij het gezag aanzien had en wellicht hierdoor dacht uit te kunnen maken wat goed en slecht was voor de bevolking. Vervolgens zien we langzaam een kentering plaatsvinden waarbij de bewoners geleidelijk meer invloed en macht verkrijgen. De bouwwereld is uiteindelijk niet in staat gebakken om grote aantallen woningen te bouwen die voldeden aan de verschillende individuele eisen van de bewoners. We zouden dus kunnen stellen dat mede door de toenemende individualiteit door de jaren heen, we nu terecht zijn gekomen bij de meest individuele manier van massawoningbouw; het ‘zelfbouwen’. Dit past ook uitstekend bij de nu geldende sociaal maatschappelijke verhoudingen. De overheid treedt steeds verder terug en bemoeit zich met minder zaken dan in het verleden het geval was. Zo zijn vele maatschappelijk belangrijke overheidsbedrijven zoals de NS, PTT of KPN in de loop der jaren geprivatiseerd. Bewoners aan de andere kant willen over steeds meer zeggenschap beschikken. Te beginnen bij datgene wat dicht bij hun staat en een belangrijke positie inneemt in hun leven, namelijk de eigen woning. TOT ZOVER IS ALLES NOG DUIDELIJK EN LIJKT HET GEHEEL EEN PLAUSIBEL VERHAAL. MAAR ALS WE NU EENS KIJKEN NAAR DE DAADWERKELIJKE UITWERKING VAN GROTE SELFBOUWPROJECTEN DAN VALT ÉÉN DING OP. HET UITBLIJVEN VAN DE VERWACHTE DIFFERENTIATIE IN WONINGTYPES. IEDERE BEWONER HEeft NAMELIJK DE MOGELIJKHEID OM PRECIES DIE WONING TE BOUWEN DIE HEM OF HAAR HET BESTE PAST. WE HEBBEN DE MOGELIJKHEID OM ONS UIT TE SPREKEN, TE LATEN ZIEN WIE WE ZIJN, ONderscheidend TE ZIJN IN DE MASSA EN TOCH DOEN
we dit uiteindelijk niet. Waar ligt dit aan? In het artikel “De woonplaats als gemeenplaats” noemen André Buys en Jan van der Schaar enkele verklaringen hiervoor. Het eerste argument is dat mensen van nu en mensen van vroeger geen veranderende functionele behoeften hebben ten aanzien van de woning. Zoals er vroeger behoefte was aan een slaapkamer, badkamer, keuken en woonkamer is dat tegenwoordig nog steeds zo. Hoogstens kunnen we stellen dat de kwalitatieve eisen inmiddels flink omhoog zijn gegaan opzicht van vroeger. Maar dit is dan ook een logisch gevolg van de toegenomen welvaart. Het tweede en interessantste argument lijkt te zijn dat wonen een middel is om sociale status of lifestyle tot uiting te brengen. Doordat wonen een middel is tot sociale expressie, kan niets anders gezegd worden dan dat het precies aansluit bij de groep of levensstijl die wordt nagestreefd. Aan de andere kant kan gezegd worden dat het ruimtegebrek waar de gehele wereld leeft het niet wenselijk en moreel verantwoord is om nog op een dergelijke manier te bouwen. Er is immers meer grond nodig om hetzelfde aantal woningen te realiseren met zelfbouwwoningen dan dat er grond nodig is voor een woontoren. Dit ruimtegebrek waar we mee kampen, hebben we deels aan ons zelf te danken. In onze voortdurende drang naar vooruitgang en welvaart vragen we het maximale van onze natuurlijke grondstoffen. Daarnaast stijgt nog altijd het aantal bewoners dat op de aarde leeft. Tel de sterk urbaniserende samenleving hierbij op en er ontstaan problemen.9 Hoe verveelend wellicht ook om te zeggen, maar zolang deze problemen niet opgelost worden, zal ondanks het sociaal maatschappelijke succes de zelfbouw a t u s s e n d e 0 e r e n toekomst hebben. En alleen al het feit dat onderhandelingen over klimaatmaatregelen ronduit moeizaam verlopen, mogen we verwachten dat oplossingen nog lang op zich laten wachten.10 Als zelfbouwwoningen dan niet een complete oplossing kunnen bieden, zijn er dan woonvormen die dit wel kunnen? Om zover te komen moeten we wellicht enige nuance aanbrengen in de eerder aangenomen veronderstelling van de individualiserende samenleving. Zo stelt Paul de Beer in het artikel ‘Individualisering zit tussen de oren’ dat de veronderstelde individualisering helemaal niet aantoonbaar te maken is. Middels een database aan gegevens verzameld
door het SCP (sociaal en cultureel planbureau) vanaf de jaren zeventig, stelt hij dat we juist meer een kuddledier zijn geworden dan wat we vroeger waren. Houdt dit dan in dat de individualisering van de samenleving berust op een illusie? Nee, maar een duidelijk antwoord hierop is moeilijk te geven. Zo zijn er alleen al vijf verschillende betekenisissen van hetbegrip individualiteit bekend in de sociologische literatuur. De twee meest aannemelijke volgens Paul de Beer zijn: fragmentering, ofwel een afname van de onderlinge samenhang tussen de opvattingen en waarden van individuen op verschillende levensgebieden en heterogenisering, ofwel een toenamen van de verschillen in opvattingen tussen individuen. Toch vangen deze begripsbeschrijvingen de term individualisering niet geheel. Ook niet als andere begripsbeschrijvingen zoals individualisering door middel van de-institutionalisering worden onderzocht. Voor dit standpunt zijn wellicht voldoende aanwijzingen zoals de gezinsverdunning, de toename van het aantal echtscheidingen, de daling van het ledenaantal van politieke partijen of de vermindering in kerkbezoek. Toch zegt dit alles niets over de instituties in het algemeen. Zo zijn misschien de bindingen met de traditionele instituties minder, maar met de moderne instituties juist meer sterker. Daarom stelt Paul de Beer voor om aan de breedte van het begrip individualisering vast te houden. Hij doet dit door de nadruk te leggen bij de uitkomst van het individualiseringsproces. Zo zou individualisering leiden tot een grotere verscheidenheid aan opvattingen (pluriformering) en tot het losser worden van de band tussen iemands opvattingen, gedrag en omstandigheden enerzijds en de sociale categorie waartoe hij of zij behoort anderzijds (privatisering). Individualisering zou ook benaderd kunnen worden als een verandering van de ‘input’ in plaats van de ‘output’. Waardoor gesteld mag worden dat de keuzemogelijkheden toenemen, maar aan de andere kant wil dit niet zeggen dat hierdoor ook andere keuzes worden gemaakt. En dus stelt Paul de Beer enigszins gechargeerd:

“Individualisering zit tussen de oren: ze komt tot uitdrukking in het feit dat steeds meer mensen op strikt individuele gronden dezelfde keuzes maken”.11

**DE URBANE ENCLAVE ALS KRITIEK OP DE VERDICHTDE, INDIVIDUALISTISCHE STAD**

Nu blijkt dat de individualisering van de samenleving toch iets ingewikkelder in elkaar steekt dan in het begin is geschetst. Wat er voor heeft gezorgd dat we met een andere blik kijken naar de populaire en veel toegepaste zelfbouwstrategie. Toch kunnen we voortborduren op de stellingname van de Beer. En in het bijzonder op de zienswijze dat wij mensen toch meer groepsgeoriënteerd zijn dan dat we tegenwoordig zelf geloven. Dit is uitermate interessant en biedt perspectieven voor de toekomst. Zo is in dit licht de benadering die architecten, planologen en politici uit de jaren zestig hadden ten opzichte van de massawoningbouw niet geheel verwerpelijk. Natuurlijk is proefondervindelijk aangetoond dat dergelijke woningbouwprojecten als de Bijlmermeer niet werken, maar de benadering om het wonen
te bekijken vanuit de massa lijkt zo gek nog niet. Maar hoe kan dit worden vormgegeven zonder dat zich een dergelijk fiasco opnieuw voltrekt? Het antwoord kunnen we vinden in de urbane enclave, die vele verschijningsvormen kent. Zo is de ‘gated community’ een van de vele vormen die een urbane enclave aan kan nemen. In de meest pure vorm is de urbane enclave een plaats waar mensen binnen een omsloten gebied dezelfde normen en waarden delen. Dit houdt in dat de urbane enclave bestaat uit een homogene groep mensen. Lange tijd werd dit gezien als onwenselijk, we zouden juist betere en plezierigere woonmilieus creëren als de bevolkingssamenstelling pluriform zou zijn (duidelijk een opvatting van een individualistisch ingestelde samenleving). Mensen met verschillende achtergrond, opleiding en overtuigingen zouden zo van elkaar kunnen leren. Inmiddels zijn we er achter dat dit niet werkt. Er ontstaan juist meer conflicten en de kwaliteit van het woonmilieu verslechtert.12

“In het algemeen geldt: hoe homogener de bevolkingssamenstelling, hoe meer contacten er zijn en hoe groter de wederzijdse beïnvloeding en daarmee de sociale cohesie is.”

Ook de recente opkomst en populariteit van het dorp, heeft binding met de woonvorm van de urbane enclave. Frans Thissen stelt in zijn artikel ‘Dorps wonen in stad en platteland’ dat het verlangen naar het dorp niet functioneel van aard is, maar eerder sociaal. Verder zegt hij dat de woonsituatie wordt beleefd vanuit vier dimensies, te weten: economisch, sociaal, cultureel en politiek. Nu zien we dat er bij economische en sociale relaties sprake is van een schaalvergroting die de bewoners niet of nauwelijks kunnen stoppen. Daarentegen zijn ze wel in staat om culturele en politieke relaties te beïnvloeden, waardoor men op dit gebied juist een schaalverkleining ziet ontstaan die sterk worden gekoppeld aan het woondomein. Kortom het dorp wordt het ideale referentiepunt, een plek waar vanuit een stevige, veilige, rustige thuishaven activiteiten worden ondernomen. Al geldt dit beeld niet alleen voor de ondernomen activiteiten, het heeft ook betekenis als ankerpunt, privédommein en verschaffer van identiteit. De woning als ‘nest’ of als ‘plek’ wordt steeds belangrijker.14 Zo beschouwd kunnen we de urbane enclave uitleggen als kritiek op de huidige samenleving en op het ontbreken van passende woonvormen. Anderzijds kunnen we ook stellen dat deze manier juist aansluit op de manier waarop wij mensen het wonen ervaren, vanuit de groep. En juist deze voorwaarden maken het mogelijk om voor grote groepen mensen woningen te creëren.

Om terug te komen op de vraag die we ons hebben gesteld aan het begin van dit essay, konden we stellen dat het ideaal van zelfbouwwoningen voortkomend uit een veronderstelde individualistische samenleving niet opgaat. Ten eerste is de individualistische samenleving niet aan te tonen en ten tweede bieden zelfbouwwoningen niet de ruimtelijke oplossingen die tegenwoordig wel wordt verlangd. De tegenhanger van de zelfbouwwoning, de urbane enclave speelt juist in
OP DE MANIER WAAROP WIJ HET WONEN ERVAREN. EN VORMT HIERDOOR ALS HET WARE KRITIEK OP DE HUIDIGE WISSELWERKING TUSSEN MAATSCHAPPIJ EN HIEROP ONTWERPEN STRUCTUUR. BINNEN DE URBANE ENCLAVE VORMT DE GROEP EEN BELANGRIJKE SCHAKEL. DIT BLIJKT ESSENTIEEL, HET WONEN IS IMMERS EEN MIDDEL TOT SOCIALE EXPRES SIE EN DAAROM GROEPSBEPAA LD. DEZE BENADERING BIEDT INTERESSANTE MOGELIJKHEDEN, ZEKER OMDAT DE RUIMTELIJKE CONFIGURATIE HOGERE DICHTHEDEN AAN WONINGEN TOELAAT. IETS WAT TEN TIJDE VAN RUIMENTEBREK ZEER WELKOM IS.
GRADUATION PLANS
Rene Brakels

Topic
High Density Outdoor space

Product
Problem statement
The outdoor space in the dense Zuidas is not functioning as the second city center it is striving to become. There are people coming to the area, but there is no attractive public space where people will linger and liven the area throughout the day or weekend. The existing buildings are islands, turned inwards. This high density urban redevelopment is lacking diversity and quality outdoor space (both public and private). According to Rudy Uytenhaak, densification causes the automatic loss of natural quality*, and Jan Gehl states that “city life does not happen by itself, or develop automatically simply in response to high density”**.

This research and design will show however, that densification can certainly improve urban outdoor space and housing by its quantity and quality. By drawing more people into the area and providing diverse places to linger, the whole area will be able to benefit from this, growing from a business district to a vibrant lively part of Amsterdam.

And while the outdoor space has been neglected by designers, mass housing has become anonymous. Identity has been lost in many modern housing developments where high density has been translated to copy one thing over and over again into monotony.

Goal
I will research how density impacts public and private outdoor space. In the end I will be able to show that this plan is an improvement to the way outdoor space in general is planned for in the Zuidas and as a working example for the larger body of architecture.

The relation of your home in the city with high density outdoor space calls to question what that home is like. Many people would prefer to live in a house with a garden over an apartment with maybe a small balcony at best. Through exploring the differences, the goal is to discover a way to make living in high density feel less like living in an anonymous stacked square box.

Process
Method description
There are three main ways that I will be conducting my research:
• literary theoretical background information
• comparative analyses
• research by design and optimization

These are researched simultaneously to be able to get a grip on all the aspects of my design project. The literary theory provides the theoretical parameters regarding the topic and design concept on which design ideas can be based. While the comparative analyses of precedents provide practical references to what works and what does not as embodiments of theory. I research by design by creating many options with input from the literary and comparative studies. These many options are part of a cyclical iterative process of continual improvement and reflection***.

From mass studies things like structure, apartment access, parking, materialization and how a balcony connects to the facade need to be worked out as the design changes stages.

* UYTENHAAK, R. 2008. Steden vol ruimte: kwaliteiten van dichtheid, Rotterdam, Uitgeverij 010, p. 8
Literature and General Practical Preference

The main literature references I have used to write my essay and base my design upon regarding density and (public) outdoor spaces are the following:

Books and Articles:

Documentaries:

Other than information from the literary study, the comparative analyses will also grant considerable insight into how space works on an urban scale as well as on a building scale. Visiting these precedents gives a feel for the scale of these large high density urban redevelopment areas and how their outdoor spaces work.

Reflection

By researching this topic I will add to the body of knowledge by creating more working examples of high density outdoor space. It is a relevant topic as densification of cities is a current issue and outdoor space is often not looked at properly in this context. Especially post war developments have underestimated the need for quality attractive outdoor space. The open spaces created during the second half of the 20th century are often undersigned left over spaces between buildings or parking spaces. This causes a loss of active life in the city, which is detrimental for the communities in which we live. Also with the Vinex typology, public and communal outdoor space has been neglected or ignored, creating the same issues as with the post war developments. A city needs to provide for its people: attractive outdoor space is a must.

Research into how 'the house' can still come back as a typology into a high density development is something that is beneficial to new developments in the future as cities become denser and denser because of an ever increasing urban population. This trend is not only happening in the Randstad, but all over the world. As the current real estate market is very unstable, the program needs to be diverse and flexible enough to deal with the changing market conditions. This also means that the project needs to be built in phases in order to be viable for investors.
Bob Zwinkels

Topic
De stad als dorp

Product
Problem statement
Wat we kunnen constateren is dat wereldwijd steeds meer mensen kiezen om in de stad te wonen, kortom de stad is populair! De gevolgen die dit fenomeen heeft op sociaal, economisch en ruimtelijk vlak zijn zeer divers en in elke stad net weer even anders. Het wonen in een stad die niet meer kan uitbreiden door het tekort aan ruimte maar wel groeit qua inwonersaantal zal dus steeds vaker voorkomen.

Dus, verdichting is een feit en de ruimtelijke gevolgen, die deze migratie teweeg brengt, kunnen we nu al zien. Deze trend heeft geleid tot een veelheid aan publicaties en onderzoeken die de theorie van ‘verdichting’ ondersteunen.

Een ander waarneembaar fenomeen is de individualisering van de samenleving. Dit gaat gelijk op met de bovengenoemde toestroom van mensen naar de stad. In deze steeds groeiende massa mensen neemt de behoefte om jezelf te onderscheiden alleen maar toe. Bovendien helpt de moderne technologie ons een handje. Zo kunnen we ons ook op sociaal gebied onderscheiden.

Bovengenoemde fenomenen hebben hun invloed op de manier waarop we in de stad wonen en leven. En we zien woonvormen ontstaan die zich schikken naar de huidige samenleving. Een bekende oplossing voor zowel het verdichten als de toenemende individualisering is differentiatie. Differentiatie in woningen en in mensen. Maar waar komt dit pleidooi vandaan? “Mensen hebben geen gedifferentieerdere wensen ten aanzien van de functionele aspecten van hun huis dan in het verleden.” Of, en kan aantonen dat gemengde woonwijken beter zijn dan homogene? Zijn we wel zo individualistisch als we zelf doen geloven? Of is de populariteit van het dorp wellicht een antwoord hierop?

Goal
Dat mensen geen gedifferentieerdere woonwensen hebben dan in het verleden wordt goed geïllustreerd bij zelfbouwkavels. Om tegemoet te treden aan de individualistische samenleving is het particulier opdrachtgeverschap opnieuw uitgevonden. Doormiddel van zelfbouwkavels kunnen particulieren hun eigen woonwensen realiseren. Toch levert het uiteindelijke resultaat vaak niet de verwachte differentiatie op. Dit ondersteunt de argumentatie dat wonen een middel tot sociale expressie is. Mensen willen ergens bijhoren of zich een bepaalde status verschaffen doormiddel van de woning.

Een tweede voorbeeld dat de relatie tussen groep en individu verduidelijkt is de opkomende populariteit van het dorp. Wij verlangen niet terug naar de fysieke condities van een dorp maar wel naar de sociale condities. We wonen graag in homogene buurten waarin iedereen dezelfde normen en waarde delen. Dit is terug te zien in het aantal sociale contacten dat wordt onderhouden. Dit ligt veel hoger dan in heterogene buurten.
We kunnen stellen dat wonen sterker aan de groep is verbonden dan we in eerste instantie denken. Het belang om ons te onderscheiden in de toenemende massa blijft bestaan maar is gericht op groepen binnen deze massa. En omdat de functionele eisen in de tijd nauwelijks zijn veranderd (hoogstens een kwalitatieve impuls), is de veronderstelling dat men zich onderscheid door gebruik te maken van uiterlijke kenmerken plausibel.

De strategie die toegepast wordt om het plangebied van de Zuidas te ontwikkelen houdt het volgende in:

Om van de Zuidas een echt stuk stad te maken zal moeten worden gestuurd op differentiatie, zowel van woningen als van mensen. Dit moet wel op een juiste manier te gebeuren. Zo is het mengen van woningtypes binnen één gebouw niet wenselijk omdat de bewoners verschillend woongedrag vertonen wat kan leiden tot conflicten. Dezelfde woningtypes in een gebouw leidt daarentegen tot verbeterde sociale contacten doordat bewoners hetzelfde woongedrag vertonen.

Daarnaast zal ingespeeld moeten worden op het verlangen naar het dorp. Wat men wellicht ook kan zien als kritiek op de hedendaagse stad. En een laatste

EIS IS DE MOGELIKHEID VOOR BEMOWERS OM ZICH TE KUNNEN ONDERSCHEIDEN IN DE MASSA EN IN DE GROEP. DE INZET VAN UITERLIJKE KENMERKEN SPEELT HIERBIJ EEN STERKE Rol.

TEVENZ ZAL HET PROJECT GEFASEERD WORDEN GEBOUWD OMDAT DAT DE ECONOMISCHE SITUATIE DE BOUW VAN GROOTSCHALIGE PROJECTEN NIET TOELAAT. OOK HIERBIJ ZAL DE INZET VAN HET INDIVIDU EN DE GROEP WORDEN GEBRUIKT OM ZO HET GEBIED BEKENDHEID TE GEVEN EN INDIRECT DE BOUW TE STIMULEREN.


LITERATURE AND GENERAL PRACTICAL PREFERENCE
