

# REFLECTION

## HOSPITABLE MOVEMENT



# Reflection

## Author

Jasper Sterrenburg - 5653673

## Tutors

Olv Klijn - design tutor

Ruurd Kuijlenburg - building technology tutor

Alejandro Campos Uribe - research tutor

## Graduation Studio

Architecture & Dwelling - AR3AD100 - Advanced Housing Design

## Date

2 July 2024

# Reflection on the process

From the start of the project, i.e. the finishing of the research plan I've been quite ambitious with the approach I took during the design and research process. I knew beforehand from my previous graduation project for the Bachelor (HBO) that I wanted to make multiple supporting booklets, covering the research in detail and summarizing that into an overall booklet covering research and design in a more concise and easier-to-read format. Back then this appeared to work quite well, so with that reference in hand I went to work on the research booklets.

With this previous experience in hand, I went to work, firstly analyzing the site once more, because I thought our group work was lacking certain essential information, such as soil conditions and site history. Parallel to this Case studies were researched and a touch later the target group was defined and also researched. Additionally, research was being done on the possibility of self-building and DIY construction. Because of this approach of doing much research in the first stages of the project, I had the idea that I was going 'off sync' compared to the other students who were starting with their designs in an earlier stadium, this was also something I noticed during the design meetings. Even though I had this feeling I continued working on the research, working less intensely on the design. My primary thought behind this approach was to let the research inform the design as much as possible, requiring fewer changes in the design down the road.

With around 60% of the research finished I started to work on the design, also because of feedback by the tutors that I should start. The approach seemed to work well if I reflect on this since the initial design phase went relatively smoothly with all the input I generated. With the design advancing nicely towards the P2 I started transferring back to the research a bit more, since the technical aspect of the building (building demountable) was not yet that far in the research. This was also planned because that information was needed later when the design transferred to a more technical phase. Transferring to this phase, literature review became less and less and research by design increased in the way of making variations on design and detail level.

I think the going off-sync approach became most apparent with the tutoring for the building technology. At first, the meetings were group-based, also covering certain themes of design. For almost all meetings I was working on something else or was further advanced instead of being on an abstract level due to the quick advancement I can make due to my technical background. If I have to admit, the first three weeks were a bit frustrating, I tend to work from details back to the building level when I have to make the technical design, whilst at the TU this is done the other way around. Although I might have been further in the process it felt that I was falling behind, not getting the most out of these meetings. Later this was resolved when we reverted to individual meetings.

Overall I can state for myself that the approach I took worked almost exactly as I hoped it would. I am quite structured in my work so having all the separate booklets approaching the project from very different angles helped keep an overview of the process. A similar systematic approach was taken in handling the feedback received from the tutors. When feedback was received, I sketched variants on this immediately when I came home. Developing it further during the week in addition to new choices. Most of the time the received feedback was firstly interpreted directly after which I gave it my interpretation, ending up in the middle.

The most useful thing that I have learned during the process is that I can make a design. I was always in the underestimation that an architect makes this concept, the holy idea, and then translates that into a design. This is something I am personally always having a hard time with. It was at the Dress Rehearsal for the P4 presentation that Olv said that the approach I take, working in variants, can also be seen as design. That felt like some sort of a relief, I can actually do this. Another insight was the fact that doing research isn't as bad as I first considered. It is not that I am going to do my Phd now, but overall I had a positive experience.

## What is ahead

Once the P4 presentation has been held, working up to the P5 presentation will be, I assume, a busy period. The first task at hand is finishing the booklets and proofreading them to have a final check of the fluency of the story. This finishing consists of adding and calculating the final detachability indexing according to the formula in the booklet. This is done for all building clusters, creating an overall average score. After this, drawings will be updated, and made to look nice and less technical than they are now. Furthermore, make an A3 set of drawings, which are a bit more technical and used as supporting elements. In the process the prototype models will be developed further, doing a lot of work back in the shed, these will also be used during the final presentation as well as supporting the prototype research. The overall layout of the booklets and drawings should be finished 3 weeks in advance for the P5 presentation, this is because they have to be printed. Why does this take so long I keep it secret because I want to keep that as a surprise. In these final weeks, I will fine-tune the presentation and work on physical models.

# Questions from the graduation manual

## What is the relation between the graduation project topic, the master track and program?

The main relation with the studio and the design project is the dwelling aspect the building accompanies with it. Patients of the hospice, as well as close by families are housed in dwellings designed for the project. Furthermore an important theme for the design studio is living with water, which is one of the main problematic in this research / design project. Another theme in the design studio is working with resources, this is found back in the demountability aspect of the building. It enables us to learn how resources that go into a building would not be disregarded but reused on a completely different site. This also joins the research gap in the self-build real, in which professionals are interviews on their view on self-building asking them for advice. Often professional and especially practical advice by carpenters is ignored or not even received by architects, this is something the master track and even the master program can learn of.

## How did the research influence the design and vise versa?

At the very start, the design that was aimed for has influenced the way research was done throughout the project. The initial idea of building demountable the survey, research on measuring demountability, and prototype research were a result. Later these research booklets influenced the design, making decisions on the gained knowledge. Also, the target group and certain decisions made in the first stages of the project are relatable to the research done on target groups, case studies, and site analysis.

## How is the relevance assessed withing the context of academic and societal value?

With the increasing aging of the population of the Netherlands and the declining birthrates of new bourne, the pressure on the healthcare system will increase. This can lead to the decline of the care that is given to someone, especially in the last phase of their lives. For a hospice, professionals are not needed, since they are run completely by volunteers, this system can have a big impact on the pressure on the healthcare by relieving pressure on the palliative care facilities. Besides the healthcare aspect, we as inhabitants of the Netherlands, need to learn how to deal with the new types of polder landscapes. This requires us the drop our defensive approach to water management, which is clearly shown in the flexible housing concept of the design project.

## How is the transferability of the project assessed?

The project is rooted in the current problems concerning peat soil in the Netherlands. In the country, we have many of those polders, on which this project can land. It doesn't per se have to be a hospice as well, this can just be the start resulting in other functions landing on similar sites. One can for instance think of refugee camps, seasonal workers, or people fleeing from war crimes, maybe even people starting out in an affordable way with a limited amount of time to build up enough financial means to buy a real house.

## How is the value of working assessed?

As described previously, the method I chose worked out well, especially because I am quite a structured person. I think reducing multiple forms of research into a concise and understandable booklet makes research more approachable.

## Is the formula for demountability reliable?

I think that at the moment the calculation of detachability potential is quite subjective. It is therefore important to keep thinking to yourself if something you draw up still meets your expectations despite what the formula might tell you. Look for instance at the movable courthouse that was moved from Amsterdam to Enschede. This building scored a whopping 8.2 on demountability, they only hade to cut open the concrete floors for them to be removed. To me, that doesn't sound like the definition of demountability.

