

Academic Year 2014-2015

campus Gent – campus Bxl – campus Gent & Bxl

architecture aAD – eAD – REAL – uAD

ma1ar – atelier sheet traject 24

part A – explanation design brief

semester	2
start	W1
Number of weeks	14
reviewweek / moment to hand in	W3, 7, 12 / hand in: W14
credits	15
professors	Mira Sanders and Jo Van Den Berghe

title

Anatomy.Waiting Rooms.
Between flux and stasis and flux.

aims/goals

General aims:

To make architecture which questions the limits of making, doing and accepting by Research by Design. The output is a work that defines and clarifies the position of the designer. The process is nourished by the student's own affinities/interests about the discipline of architecture.

Theoretical component: Mixed Media.

Keywords (general): an in-depth investigation of the personal trajectory, introspection, positioning and reflection.

- 1/ The student is able to develop a relevant design project out of various spatial scale levels and the dimension of time.
- 2/ The student is able to communicate his/her research from a artistic-architectural perspective in a visual and verbal way.
- 3/ The student is able to act methodologically throughout the designing process in a creative manner.
- 4/ The student is able to develop a relevant design, based on an complex cultural / societal context analysis.
- 5/ The student is able to integrate visual and graphical competencies in the research process.
- 6/ The student is able to expand his/her knowledge continuously and creatively.

content: theme and program

keywords (specific): waiting room, transition, (window) detail, vertical section, positioning

question

Investigate, create and explain¹ (a) coherent series of waiting rooms in the ste of the Acropolis, starting from (among other

data) a thorough reading of the text *Montage and Architecture* by Sergei Eisenstein (Eisenstein ca. 1938). The student first makes a topographic analysis of the (historical, morphological, ...) stratifications of the landscape² by means of tracing vertical sections (analysis of the whole), by identifying a point of (p)reference based on this analysis (the fragment), and by designing/creating transitions of/by a series of spaces (waiting rooms) up to the full scale architectural (window)detail (the detail).

Making vertical sections occupies a central position in the research tactics. These sections will be imagined, investigated and made in the substance of the world.

In the vertical section, spatial characteristics have to be investigated by use of the (central) perspective, which implies that the student—by definition—will have to identify his/her eye level in the perspective. So doing, the immediate relation with the human body and its size is established in this process of creation.

The cut surface in the vertical section demonstrates the anatomy of the material composition of the topography (the whole), the fragment, and the (architectural) detail.

The student also absorbs his/her tactics of the vertical section through camera-techniques as ways of looking through self defined frames, and through montage-techniques as an exercise in identifying and defining a viewpoint. Both the camera-techniques and the montage-techniques are instruments of analysis and imagination (imaging, imagineering). By means of the storyboard (among other possible techniques) the student explores and generates marking points of the trajectory through the Acropolis, and the transitions in between them.

The student selects fragments out of the topographic whole. In these fragments, the student starts an in-depth investigation of the anatomy of substance which constitutes (an) architecture. Subsequently, this investigation is being continued by the student up to the full scale architectural (window) detail. This design-research is aiming to overarch the domains of techné, via poiesis, and to penetrate by doing so in the realm of poetics in architecture.

The student actively and consequently applies the concept of 'annotated drawing' in order to make the working processes explicit through translations in written pieces of text, and in order to reach a more precise architectural discourse.

1. To explain, here, means both to express an opinion and to allocate a territory. The territory, in this context, is meant to be an architectural design as defined by an architectural vocabulary embodied by the student.

2. The landscape of the site and the references that belong to the project.

theme

Anatomy. Waiting Rooms. Transitions.

content

In the search for ways to design and make the transition theme in architecture, aiming for the intensification of the EXPERIENCE (human being as participant amidst architecture) as the antidote against architecture as OBJECT (human being as spectator from outside) which dominates contemporary architectural practice and discourse, there is a central role for the aspect of TIME to play.

* How does the student incorporate his/her awareness of metrical time (mechanical metrum) versus subjective time (organic fluidum) in creation processes in architecture, more specifically in the conscious creation of transition as tactics to give time space, and space time ?

Through the research on making in substance, as an essential part of architectural education, the student can learn the importance and the potential of mastering the laws of substance and of dealing elegantly with the rules of making, as an antidote against an actual architectural discourse which all too easily distantiates itself from these subjects.

* How is SUBSTANCE (making, that which is in the making, or which has been made) the generator of EXPERIENCE (dreaming, that which is being dreamt), starting from the most inspiring substance in the time and the space of the Acropolis as a given, more specifically along the trajectory as described by Eisenstein 'as a way of looking'. It is not our aim to make a 'replica' of 'the old', but rather it should be the purpose of this research to transform, to mutate in an embodied architectural vocabulary and architectural discourse.

In this context we are asking for:

1. Identify and situate a sequence of places on the Acropolis as the basis for the design of a coherent series of (waiting) rooms. Make 'transitions' as the generator of the experience of space and time, as 'place' and 'moment' where space becomes time and time becomes space.
The student should situate this design-research process on three levels :
- the whole (overarching vision, always in close relationship with the landscape, the topography, geology)
- the fragment (always in close relationship with the whole)
- the detail (always in relationship with the fragment and the whole)
2. Situate and develop this creation process in and from the site of the Acropolis (= the construction site). In this site, the student situates the whole/totality of his/her design proposition, in which a fragment then has to be consciously selected for more in-depth investigations, in order to (finally) reach and profoundly research the full scale constructive and architectural detail.
3. Contextualise this creation process and this creation, as the proclamation of a viewpoint (stance), in a historical perspective and in contemporary architectural practice and architectural discourse (see personal 'atlas').

The architectural drawing (the vertical section) and the scale model (the sectional scale model) are the central instruments for this research and creation process, for the research output and the final presentation. These instruments have to be consistently applied for the investigations of the context, the whole, the fragment and the detail.

A final reflection book will incorporate the process, the execution of subsequent research steps, and a reflection on the trajectory of the process.

timing and working

TIMING

PHASE I : W1 - W3 ANALYSIS & PRODUCTION (working in group):

Analysis of the Acropolis through the eyes of Sergei Eisenstein (site, geology, climate, ...); topography and data collecting: measurements, photography, drawings, ... This phase focuses explicitly on the scale of the whole. The Acropolis site has to be made as a scale model on scale 1/100 in white paper and (thin) white cardboard. In a parallel line of research, every student makes a personal 'atlas', of which the format may be a book, a set of maps and/or a film.

For Phase 1 the 'atlas' has to contain: 1/ the formulation of critical reflections around the given themes, contextualised in a landscape of references. 2/ the registration of research and creation processes, and given these a place in the critical reflections, in which the student 3/ identifies and defines a patent (license) in words and images. 4/ taking a position from where research questions for master 2 can start having a formulation.

PHASE II : W4 - W7 ARCHITECTURE & MONTAGE (working in group):

The student traces a trajectory (sequence) on the Acropolis by making use of the scale model on scale 1/100, and through 'the eye of the camera, contextualised in the theme. This sequence has to be translated in a 'film' of about 2 or 3 minutes. For Phase 2 the 'atlas' has to contain: 1/the annotation and imagination of the chosen sequence (trajectory) through the site, making use of the technique of the storyboard (photo, film, drawing, ...) and the architectural drawing (vertical section).

PHASE III: W9 - W11 PROJECT & THE DETAIL (individual work):

Rigorous design process of the waiting rooms as a coherent sequence of spaces, by (mainly) making use of the vertical section, the vertical sectional scale model and other media depending on the nature of the ongoing production. This design process is the continuation of the choice of the point of (p)reference in the context (the whole), 'out of which' a series of spaces has to be designed organically (the fragment), in order to finally reach the full scale architectural (window)detail. For phase 3 the 'atlas' has to contain: the spaces and the architectural detail, 'patented' in words and images.

PHASE IV: W12 -W13 THE JOURNEY & THE PRACTICE (individual work):

After an intense design process, the student completes his/her personal 'atlas' of the past processes. The student synthesises his/her stance in a reflection book (book, film, ...) as architectural designer. The project now has to be finalised and embedded in contemporary architectural practice and discourse.

PHASE V: Jury and exhibition.

WORKING

The students work in groups (max. 2/3) and individually. The regular studio sessions alternate with specific exercises and independent work sessions. There will be a registration of the state of the process 'before' and 'after' each session. External tutors and critics will be invited, and moments of dialogue with other studio's will be organised (vertical studio with S2 and S4). Different presentation formats will be tested: in the studio and on location.

references

- Alberti, L.B. (1485/1988), *De Re Aedificatoria* (The Ten Books of Architecture), translated by J. Leoni, edited by Joseph Rykwert, Neil Leach and Robert Tavernor, London, UK., Book i, Chapter xii.
- Asplund, G. (1935-1940), *Skogskyrkogården*, Stockholm, Zweden.
- Caruso, A. (1997), Sigurd Lewerentz and a Material Basis of Form, in *Oase Issue 45/46*, pp. 88-95, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Chevrier, Jean-François (2011), *Des territoires. L'Arachnéen*, p.216.
- Colonna, F. (1499), *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, Venice, Italy.
- De Certeau, Michel. *L'invention du quotidien*, tome 1: Arts de faire. Gallimard, Collection Folio, Nieuwe editie 1990, p. 374
- Eisenstein, S.M. (1938), *Montage and Architecture*, *Assemblage 10.12.1989*, p. 111-131. (retrieved 16.10.2014)
- Evans, R. (1997), *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays*, Architectural Association, London, UK.
- Frampton, K. (1995), *Studies in Tectonic Culture. The Poetics of Construction in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Architecture*, edited by John Cava, the MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, US.
<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract.jsessionid=9B06498D4A4C6F74B70A276960B5FE13.journals?fromPage=online&aid=1713012> (retrieved on 4 April 2012).
- *Frontiers of Space*. Barnett Newman. Interview with Dorothy Gees Seckler, *Art in America*, vol. 50, n°2, summer 1962; *Selected Writings and Interviews*, ed. John P. O'Neill. Knopf: New York, 1990, p. 251.
- Ingold, Tim. *Making. Anthropology, archaeology, art and architecture*. Routledge: London, New York, 2013, p. 163
- Latour, B., and Yaneva, A. (2008), "Give me a Gun and I will make all the Buildings move": an Ant's view of architecture, in Geiser, Reto (ed.), *Explorations in: Architecture: Teaching, Design, Research*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Switzerland.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1966), *Cézannes Doubt*, from *Collection Pensées*, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Sense et non-sens*, Les Editions Nagel, Paris, France.
- Merrill, M. (2011.b), Louis Kahn, *Drawing to Find Out: the Dominican Motherhouse and the patient Search for Architecture*, Lars Müller Publishers, Zürich, Switzerland.
- Moravánsky, Ā (2005), *Tectonics and Topography*, in: *Bearth & Deplazes: Konstrukte / Constructs*, , Quart Verlag, Luzern, Switzerland.
- Ohanian, Melik, and Royoux, Jean-Christophe (2005), *Cosmograms*. Lukas & Sternberg: New York, p. 276.
- Palladio, A. (c. 1541), drawing (plan) of the Villa Madama, Rome, Italy.
- Pérez-Gómez, A. (1994), *Polyphilo, or The Dark Forest Revisited: An Erotic Epiphany of Architecture*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England.
- Piranesi, G.B. (1761-1762), *Lago Albano*.
- Potteiger, Matthew. Purinton, Jamie. *Landscape Narratives. Design practices for telling stories*. John Wiley & sons, USA, 1998
- Proust, M. (1913), *A la Reserche du Temps Perdu: du côté de chez Swann*, Bernard Grasset, Paris, France.
- Ruskin, J. (1849), *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Wiley, New York, US.
- Scarpa, C (1957-1958), Olivetti showroom, Venetië, Italië.
- Scarpa, C. (1961-1963), *Fondazione Querine Stampalia*, Venetië, Italië.
- Scarpa, C. (1969-1978), *Brion Vega Cemetry*, San Vito d' Altivole, Italië.
- Schinkel, C.F. (1816), *Neue Wache*, Berlin, Germany.
- Tanizaki, J. (1933), *In Praise of Shadows*, English translation 1977, Leete's Island Books, Sedgwick, ME, US.
- van Schaik, L. (2008), *Spatial Intelligence: New Futures for Architecture*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, UK.
- *Verbeeldingen van werkelijkheid. Speurtochten vanuit de kerkers van Piranesi*. Volume II. Van Ruler, Dick, 010 Publishers, 1992
- Vitruvius, M.P. (85-20 BC), *De Architectura Libri Decem*, Book 1, chapter 2, paragraph 2.
- *Walking as an aesthetic practice*. Careri, Francesco. Editorial Gustavo Gili: Barcelona, 2002, p. 204.
<http://articiviche.blogspot.fr/>

evaluation format

see ects file and competention matrix;

specifically: the output will be presented on a weekly basis by the student, and in intermediary exhibits in the presence of the whole group (reviews, vertical studio) and evaluated. For the reviews, see the planning calendar. The reviews will be peer review, up-liner review by guest critics and academic review by the professors. There will be a final presentation with a public exhibition in week 14 for a jury of internal and external critics.

evaluation criteria and output format

see ects file and competention matrix;

specifically:

evaluatiecriteria:

- 1/ The student is able to develop a relevant design project out of various spatial scale levels and the dimension of time.
- 2/ The student is able to communicate his/her research from a artistic-architectural perspective in a visual and verbal way.
- 3/ The student is able to act methodologically throughout the designing process in a creative manner.
- 4/ The student is able to develop a relevant design, based on an complex cultural / societal context analysis.
- 5/ The student is able to integrate visual and graphical competencies in the research process.
- 6/ The student is able to expand his/her knowledge continuously and creatively.

format output: each student produces two components and presents these in an effective and dignifying way as an installation in a public exhibit. These two components are:

1. the architectural drawing: the vertical section(s). Each student makes sets of vertical sections of the design proposals.
2. the architectural scale model: the vertical section(s). Each student makes (these drawn) sections as scale models, including the real depth (on scale), and makes photographs and/or films of these cut-open spaces as central perspectives, with a specification of the eye level and focal distance of the section.

Next to this, the students also hands in all the documents that were required during the different stages of this exercise.