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ABSTRACT

RECONSIDERING THE COMMUNITY CENTER - RESTORATIVE STRATEGIES WITHIN EXISTING FRAMEWORKS

MAY 2014

JOHN R. GILBERT III, B.A., UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA
M.ARCH, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Kathleen Lugosch

The overarching goal of this investigation is to determine how an existing building of spatial and programmatic rigidity can serve as a framework for designing a more integrated center for personal and community development. This project is an exploration of what a building can evolve into after its "shelf-life" has expired, with the aid of a reconsidered architectural vision. Formulated within criteria individual to its context, it is intended to be an investigation of possibility and the testing of a nascent potential, not an attempt to serve as a prescriptive, panacea solution. It is an examination of a creative vision in the development of a more responsive and expressive community space.

Through this exploration, the architectural experience as derived from a subject-object perspective will be investigated and considered, as well as the art of placemaking in crafting a design strategy that is responsive to its immediate context, reconsidering the ability of architecture to generate meaning and experience outside of its prototypically considered building-envelope boundaries. By focusing on the potential to for personal
and community-based growth and development, three avenues of program will be explored: Education, Experience, and Expression. Serving as an intersection point between cultural production and cultural consumption, the transmission of this cultural capital has the ability to gestate a deeper sense of identity amongst the embedded community.
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PREFACE

Through my research of how to restore a sense of meaning and communal belonging to an existing act of design, I have developed a three part framework by which to explore these ideas. The first part of this exploration provides the foundation for my investigation. By theorizing about the role of architecture in generating a spatial experience individual to each "user", a successful form of design-intervention can be assessed in terms of its capacity to restore and regenerate a sense of identity towards the existing structure, its encompassing site framework, and its comprehensive user-base.

The notion of placemaking is then explored in an effort to gain further clarity into the fabrication of meaningful spaces that possess shared interest and respect amongst their user base. As these concepts materialize into a series of programmatic and design maneuvers, the idea of adaptive reuse is investigated in order to frame these various theories into an intervening design decision. A collection of precedents materializes these ideas in a variety of built-forms, ultimately providing insight into successful forms of architectural intervention.

Within the context of the San Francisco Glen Park Recreational Center, how can a reexamination of spatial potential within an expanded program foster a generative sense of identity amongst its community members and serve as a more integrated and site-specific form of design? Through a programmatic development that centers around three regenerative themes - Education, Experience, and Expression - a new framework is developed by which a stronger community space can be crafted.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Overview

"Architecture can be made of anything and by anyone."\(^1\)
- Jonathan Hill

"We should not live in a bright shining new future, anymore than we should hide in a comfortable pastiche of the past. We must inhabit an ever-evolving present, motivated by the possibilities of change, restricted by the baggage of memory and experience."\(^2\)
- David Chipperfield

The consideration of architecture not as something constructed but something used and inhabited is a notion intrinsic to the reassessment of a building’s reuse. Within this context of activity-based spatial definition, architecture - a formal strategy developed in response to a variety of quantifiable conditions - can be best understood within the context of a relationship. Pragmatically, architecture’s existence emerges from a series of conditions experienced between user and object. Architecture’s relevance develops primarily in its utility, prefaced by an overarching conceptual intention and understood within the notion of program. Ideally functioning within the concept of mutual dependence, the utility and success of a built form is contingent upon the relationship it generates between user and object.

What becomes of a building when user needs outgrow the original intentions of its program? Additionally, what happens to the utility of an aging structure as time inevitably shifts cultural, societal, and performative needs? Typical thought process view these issues as curable by abandonment (hopelessness) or complete and total demolition (fatality), solutions that offer little room for creative reassessment. With hope lost comes creativity squandered, opportunity overlooked, and possibility disregarded. This dilemma is a question of architectural ethics, not only detrimental to the creative process, but also to the larger and encompassing practice of design.

The ability to imbue a lost cause with a new sense of hope is an idea that has implications much wider than the specific scope of architectural interests. However, it is within these particular interests that such credence possesses the innate ability to manifest itself within a physically tangible form. To reinvestigate diminishing returns constitutes a change in perspective. To see the potential opportunity where others see failure is a truly powerful notion, one that has the ability to uproot commonly accepted expectations and reinvestigate what it truly means to practice, create, or understand the conceptual and philosophical underpinnings of architecture - a series of relationships based on mutual dependency between user and object.

1.2 - Architecture as Relationship

"There are two occupations of architecture: the activities of the architect and the actions of the user. The architect and the user both produce
architecture, the former by design, the latter by use. As architecture is experienced, it is made by the user as much as the architect.\(^9\)

- Jonathan Hill

Architectural influence occurs on an individual level. The identity of the individual is constructed in large part from experience. The experiences promoted by certain aspects of the built environment have the ability to create a lasting impression upon a user, and when a design project develops a framework intended to support and heighten these experiences, there exists a potential to create a mutually self-supportive connection between user and space. The relationship between user and object is a key concept underpinning the theoretical understanding of modern architectural practice.

If architecture is reexamined in terms of the affairs and connections it draws with its user, a more integrated understanding based on give and take can be developed. Expanding upon this notion, architecture's "creation" can be understood within both its utility and its design. Therefore, of significant importance to the success of an "act" of architecture is the very act itself. Two players carry out this act: the architect, who participates in the design process, and the user, who participates in the utilization process, ultimately giving credibility to any form of design. Without the user, the building would cease to exist anymore than as a compositional set of materials, cleverly arranged as if to invite the possibility of utility by some unannounced third party. It is through the direct act of engagement that architecture receives its birthright.

---

In his proposal for the French *Maison de la Culture in Firminy* (Culture House of Firminy), Le Corbusier depicted interior renderings replete with people in a dynamic, action-oriented state of motion. These "Cultural Houses" were founded at the end of the 1950's by France's Minister of Culture, André Malarux, and "originated as associative structures whose prime objective was to promote the independence and responsibility of the citizen with regards to social and cultural entertainment"\(^4\). With a goal-driven agenda striving for the creation of a direct interaction between the public, artists, and cultural contributors, a framework was instituted that began to reconsider the architectural potential of fostering social, cultural, and community development.

Figure 1.1 - Le Corbusier - Maison de la Culture in Firminy, Interior Sketch\(^5\)

---


\(^5\) IBID. Pg. 8
This participatory process of architecture is fundamental to evaluating the successes and failures of any given architectural act. To remove the user from the equation is as if to evaluate architecture upon an ivory pedestal equivalent with "high art". This is not the function of successful design, which should rather strive towards an integrated approach blending several categories of project-specific study into one cohesive whole. LeCorbusier's design provided a sort of “architectural neutrality” by which the activities within were deemed to be of the prime importance. The *Maison de la Culture in Firminy* however failed to produce the atmosphere with which it was depicted. The critical failure of such an assumptive position of spatial neutrality is that it presupposes a sense of ambitious social-determinacy, appropriating the assumed ideal that "if you build it, the people will come". A work of architecture must be predicated upon its specifics, and a building's success ultimately depends on a coexistence of both parties who give truth and validity to its existence - designer and user.

Understood within a subject-object approach, the relationship of architecture is one of dependence, interaction, participation, and reciprocity. This relationship is symbiotic in nature - both parties rely on each other's cooperative association in order for survival. Just as the user plays an integral role in the definition of architectural space, the production of experience can be further distilled from the user's interaction with the space. Of fundamental importance is the effect of the architectural object upon the subject, for mutual reciprocity is the foundation for any prosperous, long-term relationship.

Architectural "failures" occur when one or both parties have failed to adequately contribute to the propagation of a relationship between subject and object. Evolving user
needs, habits, desires, and/or cultural and social economic conditions, opportunities, or demands all possess the potential to catastrophically alter the course of an act of architecture. When understood within a subject-object relationship however, under-utilized or aging built forms can be reevaluated, and new possibilities can emerge with the catalytic assistance of creative thought. Redeveloping architectural potential must occur through an analysis of current needs, forecasting for longevity and founded upon a flexible commitment to re-craft a tangible form of opportunity and utility.

Architectural shortcomings must be understood as a remediable possibility. A structural failure is of catastrophic proportions; very little aside from materials and lessons learned can be salvaged. A programmatic failure however presents an open-ended potential for reincarnation through redefinition. Through analyzing an existing building in terms of its opportunities rather than its inadequacies, success can be built upon existing conditions.

A transformation of architecture can occur both physically and programmatically. Through transforming the distinct activities which occur within a building, architecture participates in the fulfillment of a need. By working within an existing building whose function has declined in necessity or completely ceased to endure, programmatic changes, envelope upgrades, and physical additions will, when performed interdependently, create success from "failure" and reconstruct the most integral notion of pragmatic architectural theory - the engaged relationship between user and object which is fundamental to the production of architectural form.
1.3 - Architecture as Experience

"Urban meaning is not imminent to architectural form and space, but changes according to the social interaction of city dwellers. Conversely, people's identity in terms of their age, gender, class and culture is partially constructed in relation to the spaces and buildings they occupy."  
- Iain Borden

"If we are to fully understand architecture, then we must consider its use and experience..."  
- Jane Rendell

The juxtaposition of architectural instruments of "new" and "old" is crucial in developing a heightened awareness regarding space's power of influence, and serves as an integral concept that must be afforded recognition when a design context is characterized by an existing structure. As architecture has the ability to craft a sense of remembrance among its users, Iain Borden states:

"This kind of remembrance is both important and timely, helping to recall destroyed structures and hidden sets of event, and in the process to resist histories being created today which erase the complexities of the past in favor of reductive accounts that serve the interests of today's ideologues."  

The urban fabric of a city is inherently replete with a juxtaposition of past history and future possibility. A typical view down Market Street in downtown San Francisco's Financial District illustrates this point through a prominent display of diverse building histories, structured alongside each other and involved in an ever-evolving conversation of stylistic differences. Each building shares its own story, possessing an individual

---

8 IBID. Pg. 12
account of its own experience. These experiences contribute to an overall character of
the city, imparting a rich narrative upon the public user base. A variety of factors can
shift the interpretation of these experiences, raising the poignancy of certain
characteristics while reducing others to vapid disinterest.

As captured in the above image, the prototypical act of emerging from the subway
to both see and experience a segment of the city's urbanity can be heightened through the
simple variability of the environment on a foggy day. Cities which speak to the senses
create spaces of intrinsic meaning through experiences impressed upon the mind. This
urban fabric, composed of sight, sound, scent, and touch, is an interactive place, a place of expression and experience. In this context, architecture extends beyond the immediacy of the building envelope and touches the inner climate of an individual's personality. While the prototypical focus of city planning agencies may be on the object - buildings and various forms of infrastructure within the urban boundaries - the emergent spatial characteristics are oriented on the subject and ultimately experienced by the people. An architecture that provides access to the expressive enterprise of its user base is a type of space-making which incorporates the human element directly into its feedback loop. The provision of a space for creative expressionism, increased self-awareness, alternative educational opportunities, and varied social encounters begins to shift the intentions of design towards a more people-oriented process.

In the crafting of an architecture that is more oriented with the needs of its user base, the cultural anthropologist Edward Hall argues that mankind's senses are utilized in different degrees by different people as they interact with their environment. By understanding that man and his environment engage in a participatory relationship where each one molds and influences the other, a successful design approach can derive insight from the proxemic needs of the very user being designed for.

Within the United States, our current city-planning practices are only starting to recognize the human dimension of urban design. Modernistic design principles successfully removed the human element from the design process and replaced it with the utilitarian, the rational, and the technologically-ideal. In result, we are only now

---

10 IBID. Pg. 6
beginning to realize the amount of improvement necessary to restore, revitalize, and redesign our cities so that our spaces redirect their focus to a human perception of space.

According to Hall, the result of these Modernistic design principles that guided our planning policies have resulted in urban spaces that provide little excitement or visual variation, and virtually no opportunity to build a kinesthctic repertoire of spatial experiences\textsuperscript{11}. Furthermore, man's sense of space is closely related to his sense of self, an intimate transaction with his environment\textsuperscript{12}. The environment holds the potential to inhibit or encourage this sensory relationship, and therefore is crucial in crafting a meaningful connection between man and place.

Our conventional understanding of spatial experience is influenced and molded by our urban environment. The method by which we interact with this environment is integral to our understanding of, appreciation for, and relationship with our embedded landscape, and different forms of interaction will invariably produce different results of experience. It is chiefly this method of \textit{experience} that dictates understanding, and by designing in a method that inspires a certain element of experience, we can encourage the fabrication of differentiated spaces which foster the richness and variety of the life which they are designed to encourage and uplift. A rich spatial experience is one that draws upon a varied level of sensory interaction to craft a meaningful relationship with the user.

An interactive and experience-based occupation of our surroundings leads to an increased spatial understanding and deepened relationship with a given environment\textsuperscript{13}.

\textsuperscript{12} IBID. Pg. 60
\textsuperscript{13} IBID. Pg. 108
Within this context, architecture can be understood in a new framework when considered from the perspective of a user's spatial envelope and how this fosters an interaction with his/her urban surroundings. The form of "direct engagement" is one of the most satisfying, as it fosters a reciprocal relationship between a user and his/her immediate space.

Figure 1.3 - Author - Wallride, Long Beach City

The act of skateboarding is directly predicated on the development and maintenance of a user-spatial relationship. The ability to experience one's immediate environment in a non-traditional format is a creative reconsideration of spatial "boundaries" and the fabrication of a hybridic form of "architecture" through the experience of space-making. A personalization of space as explored through a variety of artistic outlets is a creation and display-based experience, an architecture of process. As the needs of a user can be creatively redefined, Hall states that "different use of senses leads to very different needs
regarding space"\textsuperscript{14}. Expanding upon the idea of proxemic patterns within a macro-scale, cultural context, Hall elucidates his point:

"Proxemic patterns differ. Through examination, hidden cultural frames can be revealed that determine the structure of a given people's perceptual world. Perceiving the world differently leads to differential definitions of what constitutes certain actions, and such insight can lead to better informed decisions on behalf of architects and planners regarding different types of cities and design decisions that are consistent with the proxemic patterns of the people who live in and utilize them."\textsuperscript{15}

By planning and designing for the human dimension, a diverse, satisfying, and humanly amiable solution to urban problems can be addressed. Hall outlines four summated solutions for city planning issues that evolved from his understanding of proxemic space and the needs of the city dweller\textsuperscript{16}:

1. Find suitable methods for computing and measuring the human scale in all its dimensions, including the hidden dimensions of culture.
2. Develop a close identification between the image that man has of himself and the space that he inhabits.
3. Conserve large, readily available outdoor spaces.
4. Preserve useful, satisfying old buildings and neighborhoods from urban renewal.

Resultantly, the application of these ideas to architecture is one whereby which design is informed on the basis of an initial understanding of the needs of the very people being designed for. A positive reinforcement of their culture that helps to provide identity and strength can be compounded through the design of an environment that structures lasting relationships between user and spatial manifestation\textsuperscript{17}.

\textsuperscript{15} IBID. Pg. 153
\textsuperscript{16} IBID. Pg. 167-168
\textsuperscript{17} IBID. Pg. 168-169
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1.4 - Designing for the Individual, Designing for the Community

"The individual is the authentic carrier of reality."

- Carl Gustav Jung

Our self-knowledge is intrinsically based off of social factors. Through the knowledge we develop of others, we increase our own self-awareness, shifting, broadening, and expanding our individual perspectives in a manner rooted within our experience. A user-based design can provide a framework for retracing social and cultural connections through influencing the development of the individual while fostering the broadened evolution of the community.

Figure 1.4 - Carl Sagan - Pale Blue Dot

---

The learning capacity of man is one of the most genuine drives towards the progressive transformation of human behavior\textsuperscript{20}. Our ability to broaden and expand our perspective is a self-evolutionary characteristic that provides for a deepened connection and understanding to the world we live in. The circled dot in the image above is Earth, home to a global human population of over 7 billion. Taken in 1990 by the Voyager 1 space probe approximately 3.7 billion miles away, Carl Sagan explains its significance profoundly:

"Our posturings, our imagined, self-importance, the delusion that we have some privileged position in the Universe, are challenged by this point of pale light. Our planet is a lonely speck in the great enveloping cosmic dark. In our obscurity, in all this vastness, there is no hint that help will come from elsewhere to save us from ourselves...It is up to us...There is perhaps no better demonstration of the folly of human conceits than this distant image of our tiny world. To me, it underscores our responsibility to deal more kindly with one another, and to preserve and cherish that pale blue dot, the only home we've ever known."\textsuperscript{21}

While the individual features of man are paramount to his self-knowledge, the ability to identify with and relate to people of a varying, and equally personalized life experience is one of the strongest ways to expand our understanding of humanity. The community is the representation and personification of a diverse range of individual personalities, and its strength is contingent upon the cohesion of the individuals comprising it. Through the development of these relationships and an articulation of self-expression, a community can be strengthened from the inside out. With the assistance of design, the provision of a forum for people to educate and express themselves is fruitful not only in contributing to

\textsuperscript{20} Jung, Carl. \textit{The Undiscovered Self}. New York, NY: Mentor, 1957. Pg. 92
the diversity of each individual's life experience, but also in developing a community of cohesion.
CHAPTER 2
PLACEMAKING

2.1 - Overview

"Place is not merely what was there, but also the interaction of what is there and what happened there."22

- Robert Fleming

The concept of placemaking refers to a design strategy predicated upon the value of the human experience, and an ability to create a memorable association of lasting significance. Meaningful places and urban environments are those that have responded to a sense of responsibility to tell their story and recycle memory through the inspiration of further stories. Public venues possess a specific opportunity to craft a sense of placemaking, contingent upon a mixture of memory, experience, art and culture23. In order for a building to establish a narrative of richness, its context, creation, and history must be worthy of celebration. By recognizing the necessity to craft spaces of meaning within our current design strategies, Robert Fleming states the following:

“The question in the art of placemaking today is how to build the armature of mental associations into a sustainable narrative that enriches site and helps make them memorable...It is the capacity of the tangible physical environment to live on in the mind that is so fundamental to the art of placemaking. Just as memory can nourish place, so imagination can reinvigorate it and extend its resonance."24

23 IBID. Pg. 14
24 IBID. Pg. 17
Fleming proposes four outlined design objectives in the reclamation of languid public spaces:\(^5\):

- **Orientation** – Through research that reveals a space’s layers of meaning, community interaction can restore a sense of significance.
- **Connection** – An integrated sense of design applied through a site can result in a space of meaning.
- **Direction** – Clear visitor navigation can be achieved through visual clarity and a linking of placemaking elements.
- **Animation** – The allowance of meaningful uses and activities create a connection between user and space.

This framework can be used to evaluate the areas of improvement necessary within an existing structure and its associated site. In certain cases, places that fail to correctly respond to the human element by possessing a collection of amnestic conditions provide an opportunity to be reimagined and brought to life if a design intervention successfully restores a vision of place. A public value and community connection can be ascribed to a design if it crafts a lasting mental association amongst its users through the meaningful activities and experiences they share with it.

### 2.2 - Public Parks and Placemaking

"The power of place – the power of ordinary urban landscapes to nurture citizen’s public memory, to encompass shared time in the form of shared territory – remains untapped for most working people’s neighborhoods in most cities..."\(^6\)

- Dolores Hayden

---


Public parks offer an innovative landscape for placemaking within our urban environments as the meaning and utility ascribed to them is primarily developed through their use and experience by members of their surrounding community. While typically considered advantageous public offerings conferred upon an urban populace devoid of a "natural experience", urban critic Jane Jacobs reconsiders the park as a deprived place whose legitimacy is achieved through the necessity of the appreciation, experience, and utility given to it by its public user-base. Jacobs argues that parks aren't just used because they're there, but rather "people...confer use on parks and make them successes - or else withhold use and doom parks to rejection and failure". Ultimately arguing that the successes and failures of parks are determined by the public's engagement with them, a public space must be designed in a manner predicated upon the human element.

The manner in which parks and public spaces are used determines their role within the community. As such, it is of vast importance to involve the community in the spaces designed for public use in order to provide opportunities to ascribe the environment both meaning and purpose. The ability to engage in a positive, creative, and varied experience is one of the most beneficial provisions a public space can offer its users, for it is through these experiences that meaning is generated. This meaning is what catalyzes the development of an individual's sense of self - a meaningful relation to a place, an idea, or another person. By providing a place replete with meaning, garnished through experience, a city park offers its users a closed loop cycle - through its utility, it gains its purpose. Through the user's experience, they evolve their identity.

This self-nurturing cycle of user experience and connection to place only serves to catalyze liveliness and variety. Expanding upon the multi-layered role of the city park, Jacobs states the following:

"Neighborhood parks fail to substitute in any way for plentiful city diversity. Those that are successful never serve as barriers or as interruptions to the intricate functioning of the city around them. Rather, they help to knit together diverse surrounding functions by giving them a pleasant joint facility; in the process they add another appreciated element to the diversity and give something back to their surroundings."  

When viewed from a macro-scale, the diversity of a city speaks to the larger understanding of modern cultural and societal experience. The diversity of a culture and society composed of individual beliefs, morals, and perspectives are a critical factor for the awe and majesty of our life experience. Narrow minds concern themselves with their own selfish pursuits, while broadened perspectives share amazement in the varietal makeup found amongst the whole of human life. To provide a place that initiates these varied forces is fundamental in the construct of a civic design approach that strives to contribute to the cultural and social development of its populace.

Urban diversity further stimulates the connection of public to place. Touching upon four design elements which are contributory factors to the development of well-utilized parks, Jacobs argues that greatly loved places benefit from a certain "rarity value". The first of these, intricacy, is "related to the variety of reasons for which people come to neighborhood parks". Intricacy is important for the stimulation of differing uses, and the resulting psychological experiences that can be evoked in its users.

"..."  

---

29 IBID. Pg. 102
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The expressions of difference throughout the park - whether by means of architectural
design, tree groupings, or landscape features - is a key element in fostering a user's
sustained and developed interest. This intricacy can be employed successfully within an
architectural design if the design seeks to integrate these differing elements together
within a comprehensive strategy. While this need not be complicated in formalized
execution, it involves the consideration of a variety of highly interdependent factors.
Recognition of these factors, followed by thoughtful consideration early on in the design
process, can ensure that a design is crafted which is creative, responsive, and contextually
based.

The second of these elements, centering, is regarded as a climactic point of a new
design. According to Jacobs, "...for neighborhood parks, the finest centers are stage
settings for people"31. Park attractors, or "demand goods", can serve as a form of
centering. Music, plays, and social events are highly important and often overlooked
forms of park demands goods that can casually introduce cultural life into a city. Sun and
enclosure are the remaining categorical points of Jacob's assessment for successful
neighborhood parks. The consideration of sun and obstacles which may impede or
permit it must be considered, as well as the presence of an enclosing boundary, which
serves to highlight the park's importance within its surrounding urban landscape. Jacobs
argues that diversity, mingled in mutual support, is needed so that "city life can work
decently and constructively, and so the people of cities can sustain (and further develop)

their society and civilization"\textsuperscript{32}. This urban diversity, coupled with these various factors, serves to articulate the specialized abilities of public parks to contribute to or detract from an urban neighborhood's sense of self - an objective ultimately contingent upon a diverse mixing of uses and users.

2.3 - Roof and Context

"What is true of an interesting roof is true of the work of architecture in general: that it, as a whole, integrates multiplicity into its form. It is a matter of exterior and interior, of space and prism, of the building itself and its context, of shelter and of an opening, of meaning and effect - and all of this together."\textsuperscript{33}

- Barbara Burren

Exploring the relationship of roof to architectural product is an important prerequisite in the process of crafting a creative design-intervention within the context of an existing structure defined by iconic roof forms. It is therefore important to understand the role of the roof in inspiring an architectural quality inherent within the building form's totality. Within a given form of architecture, the roof typically serves as the uppermost form of containment, playing a predominant role in the creation of space within a building's interior envelope and commenting, whether to the conscious or unconscious intentions of the designer, upon the context of the building amongst its site-specific surroundings. The nature of this effect within and upon this quality of space - both interior and exterior - is controllable through a design that detracts itself from a typical,
Modernist-inspired flat roof. Within the relationship created between a roof and its subsequent spatial quality is an opportunity of extension outside of the immediate building envelope. According to Barbara Burren, the roof can "focus attention on the possibility of permitting surfaces to engage space by means of their sculptural modulation and to link geometry and imagination"\textsuperscript{34}. When used as a specific reference point, the roof can be used as a catalyst for design which explores a new direction for spatial consideration.

Buildings are typically seen as "object-like" because their entirety is self-referential, possessing an unstable relationship to their surrounding context by nature of their independent form. Martin Tschanz elucidates that a roof form possesses an "enormous architectural expressive potential in terms of the figurative quality"\textsuperscript{35}, and while "every building exists in a context to which it cannot help but to relate...the forming of the roof is an effective means to gain control over this relationship and to determine its form deliberately"\textsuperscript{36}. The roof can therefore be used to strengthen a building's conditional response. It can be used to craft an individual character, an expressive personality, or to orient the building to the landscape, creating a relationship between various contextual elements which might otherwise be overlooked, unconsidered, ignored or avoided entirely. It has the ability to provide further possibility for a deeper construct of meaning and significance within the built form. The roof can serve as a formalized, topographical integration through camouflage, mimesis, or

\textsuperscript{35} IBID. Pg. 41
\textsuperscript{36} IBID. Pg. 47
abstraction. This integration can occur through emphasizing existing conditions or through a counter-movement which detracts from its context through the provision of an abstracted reference point.

Figure 2.1 - The Athanassiades Residence - Roof Form

The *Athanassiades Residence* by David Hotson Architects is an additive residential design inspired by the formal derivation of an existing gambrel roof line. By means of a modern addition connected to the roof edge of the original structure, the existing is transformed into a reminiscent image of itself through contemporary extension and reinterpretation. The addition is attached to the existing structure by means of three skewed parallel steel beams, which the eave trim of the original roof follows into the new

---

structure. Material shifts occur at the intersection between existing and addition, blurring the boundaries between past and present as the form extrapolates familiar characteristics of the original building in a new, stylistically derived structure.

![The Dune House - Roof Form](http://www.archdaily.com/175734/dune-house-jva/)

**Figure 2.2 - The Dune House - Roof Form**

The *Dune House* by JVA Architects presents an insightful, contemporary reinterpretation of its neighboring British seaside roof-forms. These roofs are formally eclectic, composed of a variety of dormers, gables, gambrels, and pitches. In response, the *Dune House* references the formal presence of its neighboring context, and offers a creative insight into rethinking the pitched roof in a modern context. Through abstracted
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mimicry of its immediate context, a geometrically fragmented roof form coherently houses a single program function within its boundaries.

The roof form can be used to draw a connection between different aspects of its context, create vertical relations between the ground and the uppermost plane, and tune spatial sequences within. As expanded upon by Martin Tschanz, "the sloped roof can pick up on different aspects of its context and bind them to one another...in this way, it can act as an intermediary within a heterogeneous context". By imagining it within its context as an adaptive vessel to align, reference, and reinterpret a building with its surrounding context, a roof can therefore be born of site, situation, and circumstance, not simply being restricted to serve as the terminus of a building's spatial envelope.

CHAPTER 3
BUILDING REUSE

3.1 - Overview

"Restoring significant shared meanings for many (neglected) urban places first involves claiming the entire urban cultural landscape as an important part of history, not just its architectural monuments...Second, it involves finding creative ways to interpret modest buildings as part of the flow of contemporary city life. A politically conscious approach to urban preservation must go beyond the techniques of traditional architectural preservation (making preserved structures into museums of attractive commercial real estate) to reach broader audiences. It must emphasize public process and public memory."

- Dolores Hayden

The union of old and new architecture is a topic of design that is characterized by many different perspectives and widely differing points of departure. While there exists a multitude of opinions about what, where, when, and why, a successful design ultimately possesses a recognizable degree of contrast between original and addition. In the words of architect Charles Bloszies,

"It is much easier to create a counterpoint to an outstanding old building than to a mediocre old building."

Within this vein of thought, an architecture of well-articulated simplicity appears to be most effective in mediating the time gap between two different styles of design. As our existing built environment is not always characterized by "outstanding old buildings",

how can architecture mediate the difficulties of improving upon "mediocre old buildings"? Not every building warrants an intervening strategy, but whether for aesthetic, conceptual, programmatic, or preservation reasons, a hybridic form of design has the ability to retain the history of a site, while imbuing it with an expanded context and reconsidered realm of meaning and possibility.

3.2 - Politics

With the establishment of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in 1966, the United States Congress voted to mandate the "active use of historic buildings for the public benefit and to preserve our national heritage." Determining whether a building is recognized as a nationally-registered historic place depends on the following Criteria for Evaluation:

"The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. That are associated with the lives of significant persons in or past; or
C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

D. That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.\textsuperscript{43}

California's State Historical Resources Commission has furthermore designated a state program known as the California Register to recognize resources of historic significance. A series of four criteria apply, and focus upon from a building’s association with the following\textsuperscript{44}:

- Events of local or regional significance (Criterion 1)
- Individuals of local or state significance (Criterion 2)
- Construction characteristics of significance (Criterion 3)
- Information important to the historical significance (Criterion 4)

Registering a building as a California Historical Resource has the ability to elicit further CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review if "threatened" by a project, garnish code alternatives and easements in the case of preservation work or additional construction, and receive property tax reductions.

In addition to these programs, the Secretary of the Interior has proposed a series of four guideline treatment approaches in the decision-making process regarding the alteration of existing buildings. These include Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction, and are defined as follows\textsuperscript{45}:

\textit{Preservation: Places a high premium on the retention of all historic fabric through conservation, maintenance and repair. It reflects the building's


continuum over time, through successive occupancies, and the respectful changes and alterations that are made.

Rehabilitation: Emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but more latitude is provided for replacement because it is assumed the property is more deteriorated prior to work.

Restoration: Focuses on the retention of materials from the most significant time in a property's history, while permitting the removal of materials from other periods.

Reconstruction: Establishes limited opportunities to re-create a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object in all new materials.

These legislative issues which require the preservation of older, historically-defined buildings have the potential to create a stumbling block for certain acts of architectural necessity. The requirement to preserve an unworthy building in its entirety due to its consideration as a landmark structure by virtue of age or other potentially myopic viewpoints has the ability to result in an unsatisfactory and unsuccessful design compromise. Every building must be evaluated in terms of its own specific criteria and assessed based on its areas of salvageability and merited potential.

In conjunction to considering the prospective opportunities within a work of architecture, it must be recognized that every building has a lifespan, and resuscitation attempts must be coupled with serious electrical, mechanical, structural, and aesthetic upgrades. Older buildings are inevitably out of current building code standards, and must be modified for compliance - often to extreme degrees. With the addition of the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the majority of structures which predated this legislation require significant alterations to provide for disabled user-accessibility. Energy consumption must also be considered, and will inevitably require additional
thermal insulation, air and vapor barriers, wall cavity repairs, and a myriad of other efficiency-based improvements. In these cases, it is important to weigh cost vs. benefit, and consider all possible options.

3.3 - Working with Context

Architecture that blends an old form of design with a modern approach can be considered a radical departure from what is understood to be a more typical design strategy. When executed properly, this synthesized alternative has the potential to create a reconsidered understanding of how an intervening form of architecture can realign, retrace, or redefine a design context. Just as social diversity is the key to creating a better understanding of ourselves and each other, architectural diversity contributes to an expanded appreciation of our urban environment, and evolves the fabric of a living, progressive city.
The question of context inevitably arises when an act of design merges old and new forms together into a hybridic whole. This convergence of styles is not restricted to the work of contemporary design - historically speaking, certain examples exist which blend diverging styles together at various points in time. The Duomo of Siracusa (Syracuse Cathedral) in Sicily, Italy was originally built as a Greek Doric temple with a Romanesque second story and nave added on in the following centuries, eventually receiving a Baroque facade following an earthquake in 1693. These three stylistic juxtapositions blend into a coherent whole, in part due to their similar material compositions and subtle design qualities which support the same overarching programmatic goal. Each successive addition succeeds, as it is stylistically complementary, not competitive.

While architectural styles historically evolved in pace with the development of
civilization, culture, and society, today's contemporary attitudes are in a state of dynamic
fluidity. Multiple stages of opinion exist regarding how to appropriately work within an
existing architectural context, but the most successful forms of intervention occur when
the distinction between old and new design is either clear, obvious, and artfully
articulated or subtle and formally referential. Ultimately, an intervening design strategy
in which the retained component maintains its original design integrity provides a
successful, context-specific framework for a respectful merging of old and new
architecture.

---

The Duomo of Siracusa - Exterior Facade with Embedded Doric Capitals. Image retrieved April 14,
2014 from http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Duomo_di_Siracusa
CHAPTER 4
PRECEDENT STUDIES

4.1 - Overview

Within these precedent case-studies, a categorical approach has been taken to understand each example within the context of its functional, intervening strategy. They include examining the building as:

- **Artifact & Shell** - The existing structure is showcased, and there is a reference to the past via a selective retention of elements and creative addition of new parts. The existing envelope of the building is typically retained, resulting in a sense of "facadism".

- **Symbiotic** - Both old and new structures are heavily reliant upon each other for understood formal meaning. The forms may differ and diverge completely, but a sense of coherence is achieved through juxtaposition.

- **Extension / Extrusion** - Similar to symbiosis, yet formally referential to the original building language. The form may be derived, "rifffed", or extrapolated from elements of the retained historical fabric. The form may "extrude" itself out of this fabric, appearing as a new attachment.

- **Exoskeleton** - Through a formalized new and visible framing scheme, an interstitial space is created alongside the existing structure. This is typically employed alongside another category, such as artifact & shell.

- **Infill** - A new addition fills a physical gap between two or more existing structures. This can be achieved through selective removal of an existing portion, or through the occupation of open and unused space. An infill strategy acts and functions as a bridge between elements, closing a visible gap and tying segregated pieces together into a more coherent whole.
4.2 - Program & Adaptive Reuse Strategy

4.2.1 - AART Architects - The Culture Yard

Architects: AART Architects
Location: Elsinore, Denmark
Program: Cultural & Knowledge Center
Size: 139,931 ft²
Project Year: 2011
Intervention Strategy: Artifact & Shell, Exoskeleton

AART Architects utilized a former series of shipbuilding warehouses as the format for creating Denmark's Culture Yard, an adaptive reuse intervention that functions as a cultural center serving as a transformative gateway between past and present histories within the quaint, historic town of Elsinore. The main building functions as a public library spanning three floors, and is flanked alongside the edges by a concert hall, exhibition rooms, conference rooms, a dockyard museum, and small cafes. Clad in a glass and steel facade, the new exterior creates an engaging interstitial space, bound by the existing brick facade of the original structure and its intervening extension. This triangulated, exterior curtain wall creates a full-height atrium along the building's length for both cafe and leisure opportunities, further serving as a canopy for outside patrons. By folding the facade at strategic angles and cladding it with a perforated steel screen, excessive light infiltration is reduced and prevented from overwhelming the interior atrium spaces. When viewed at dusk, this transparent facade is illuminated by a soft glow, ensuring that the building maintains a constant dockside presence both day and night.
Emphasizing the town of Elsinore as a both a local and global modern cultural hub, *The Culture Yard* serves as a palpable transition between old ideas and new activities. Reinforcing this notion are numerous architectural gestures which showcase both old and new construction methodologies. The building's original concrete skeleton has been retained and reinforced, yet left exposed in reference to its past history. Materiality further increases the effect of experience, as wrought iron, concrete, glass, steel, and timber all interact throughout the building's various details. Triangular balconies extrude from the existing building into the atrium space, serving as lookout points to the neighboring Kronborg Castle and the Danish Sound. These techniques have
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succeeded in creating a space where both past and present are merged amongst the social and cultural capital of Elsinore's community.

Figure 4.2 - The Culture Yard - Interior Atrium Detail

Figure 4.3 - The Culture Yard - Exterior Facade Detail


4.2.2 - Calderon-Folch-Sarsanedas Arquitectes - Centre Leonce Georges

Architects: Calderon-Folch-Sarsanedas Arquitectes
Location: Chauffailles, France
Program: Multifunctional Community Center
Size: 38,119 ft²
Project Year: 2011
Intervention Strategy: Artifact & Shell, Extension, Infill

Serving as a multifunctional community center, the Centre Leonce Georges is a preservation and addition strategy that incorporates local materials in the production of a highly meaningful structure of provincial significance. Acquiring the site formerly occupied by a neglected farm, the design occupies the same characteristics inherent within the original construction. In barn or granary design, a simple form and spatial layout is generally dictated and underscored by a need to store materials. In the Centre Leonce Georges, the original barn L-shape construction was maintained, while the existing timber beams, stone masonry walls, and tiled roof have been restored. The addition occupies the neighboring yard and is composed of a volume clad in locally sourced Douglas Fir, braced by light steel frame construction.
Programmatically, the new addition is spacious, simplistic, and permeable in character: large community meetings, weddings, receptions, and dance parties can all be held within its walls, and spatial transitions are heightened by angular roof forms and triangular skylights. These angular roof planes contrast to the strict orthogonal farmhouse embedded within the addition. A subtly recessed entryway begins a sequence of experiences that are enhanced upon encountering the large, triangular skylight that permits natural daylight to penetrate deep into the structure's open floor plan. Operable, folding walls open into the surrounding landscape and encourage interior and exterior utilization. Through employing simple architectural gestures and the use of culturally-significant materials, the building fosters a relationship with its immediate landscape, its encompassing region, and its local patrons.

Figure 4.5 - Centre Leonce Georges - Interior and Skylights

Figure 4.6 - Centre Leonce Georges - Interior Interface Between Old and New

---


4.2.3 - Ingarden & Ewy Architects - Malopolska Garden of Arts

Architects: Ingarden & Ewy Architects
Location: Krakow, Poland
Program: Cultural Center
Size: 46,616 ft²
Project Year: 2012
Intervention Strategy: Artifact & Shell, Extension, Exoskeleton

Acting as a modern, multifunctional arts and cultural institution for Krakow, Poland, the Malopolska Garden of Arts (MGA) is inclusive of a theatre, cinema, cafe, conference room, multifunctional events hall, and modern art and multimedia library. The four-story addition is an adaptable, hi-tech cultural venue attached to a 19th century horse-riding arena, clad in ceramic clay tile louvers and framed in glass. An open-work, steel structure roof extends from the building over an exterior garden courtyard, thematically enclosing the space while permitting existing trees on site to continue to grow without vertical restriction. This extension visually transports the interior program out onto the site, and offers invitation for patrons to experience this outdoor landscape before entering the building through the original preserved structure, visible at the end of the garden and enclosed in glass. Serving as the main entry point for the institution, this garden expresses a sense of openness through its freely accessible space, underscored by the transparency of its enclosing building form.

Formally, the addition draws inspiration from its local context, referencing both the pitched roof geometries and compositional building elements of its neighboring structures, serving as an experiment in both contextual mimicry and creative abstraction.
Building transparency is achieved through the use of glass, clad in vertical ceramic tiles, to create a contemporary facade emergent from the existing historical context.

Figure 4.7 - MGA - Exterior Context

Figure 4.8 - MGA - Framed Exterior Garden


4.2.4 - LTL Architects - Arthouse

Architects: Lewis Tsurumaki Lewis Architects (LTL)
Location: Austin, Texas
Program: Art Gallery & Event Space
Size: 23,800 ft²
Project Year: 2010
Intervention Strategy: Artifact & Shell, Symbiotic

Lewis Tsurumaki Lewis Architect's (LTL) Arthouse project reconceives a 1920s theater-converted-1950s-department-store as a departure point for a design intervention, which embraces the existing construction through a modern programmatic reinterpretation. Originally crafted as a structural concrete frame with steel trusses and an interior steel frame with concrete decking, a series of design additions and adjustments supplement and expand upon the building's existing features. A steel-track suspended mobile gallery wall attached to the bottom chords of the existing steel truss I-beams both stiffen the structure and provide a programmatic insertion that is able to be adjusted depending on circumstance. Modulating between a single space and split gallery, the reconfigurable display wall is a highlight feature of the second floor exhibition gallery.

The exterior street-side elevation of the building is punctured with a series of laminated glass blocks, aggregated in a gradient of programatically determined necessity. The insertion of a new central stair which extends out of the main-floor reception desk and connects into the roof deck serves as an architectural gesture which physically and visually links all three floors together into a coherent whole. The upper-level roof deck operates as a gathering place for social events, artistic performances, and
film screenings, crafting a cultural and social connection to place within the urban core of downtown Austin, Texas.

---


4.2.5 - Project Orange - 192 Shoreham Street

Architects: Project Orange
Location: Sheffield, England
Program: Restaurant, Bar, & Residence
Size: 10,656 ft²
Project Year: 2012
Intervention Strategy: Artifact & Shell, Symbiotic

192 Shoreham Street is a project completed by architectural firm Project Orange, based in London, England. Functioning as an adaptive reuse design with a post-modern, contemporary addition, the project reclaims an existing, unoccupied Victorian-age industrial brick building. Formerly a coachworks warehouse, the building was not historically registered but possessed a strong notion of local, neighborhood significance. Occupying a corner lot at the intersection of two streets in Sheffield, England, the project successfully adapts a space previously used for an antiquated purpose and reincarnates it with a current program centered around a lower-level bar and restaurant, with three additional studio offices on the upper-level addition.

The project is a successful form of architectural intervention. The unused space has been reincarnated, arising from its slumber and evolving into a new, current, and modern personality. As the building previously brought profit, prestige, and economic drive to the city, the project serves a deeper purpose of preserving a past understanding of the structure’s historical significance, while becoming an archetypal example of contemporary reuse. The dynamic addition rising from the previous roof form evokes a thematic recognition and interpretative reassessment of the characteristic roof forms defining the city in decades past. The architects used these previous roof forms as a
conceptual informer from which they could reinterpret and modulate a contemporary statement.

The spatial reconstruction crafts a completely new building informed by the previous structure, symbiotic and yet independent at the same time. The old building was an architectural resource replete with a multi-dimensional composition of layers: history, memory, economy, architectural traditions, and materials. The new building uses these as fodder from which to evolve its own agenda, enlivening the functionless space with a new programmatic vision. In a similar motion, the formal character of the new roof form becomes a conscious statement of respectful reference, honoring the past and redefining the present while crafting a new understanding and concept of future possibility.

The intersection of two layers of history is artfully woven together with this rooftop extrusion. The old steel mill's existing brick structure is worn and aged with signs of time and experience, possessing a certain knowledge of history and place that is directly embedded within its walls. The additive black steel extension overhangs, intersects with, and gently rests atop of the existing structure, symbolizing a sensitive relationship that is somewhat parasitical in nature. This contemporary addition reaffirms the presence and utility of the existing building, forming a coherent whole whose existence is predicated on the intertwining of both building forms. The success of the architectural whole is dependent on the existence of its parts. Both structures exist in a co-dependent relationship while the completed whole possesses relevance and functionality.
Figure 4.11 - 192 Shoreham St - Exterior Context

Figure 4.12 - 192 Shoreham St - Original Conditions

5.1 – Overview

One of San Francisco's 36 official neighborhoods, Glen Park is located on the southern end of the city and is characterized by a close knit, unique and expressive community atmosphere with steep, topographical changes distinctive of San Francisco. While the urban core of San Francisco is characterized by a typical "grid pattern" layout, Glen Park's street distribution follows the contours of its hillside elevations and its residential areas extend out from the edges of the area's natural canyon and city park.

Nestled at the southern edge of this diverse, 66.6-acre park and directly off of O’Shaughnessy Boulevard and Elk Street just north of Southern Embarcadero Freeway I-280, the Glen Park Recreational Center extends basic recreational opportunities to the public, and is in the process of undergoing a $12 million dollar redevelopment proposal via the 2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond. This project investigates how
the programmatic and spatial rigidity of this structure can serve as a framework for designing a more integrated center for personal and community development.

5.2 – Site History

Having evolved from a remote, rural canyon landscape into a small-town community neighborhood over the past century, Glen Park possesses a rich history within the context of San Francisco's urban development. Originally purchased by future San Francisco mayor Adolph Sutro in the 1850s and nicknamed “Gum Tree Ranch” in response to the large swaths of blue gum eucalyptus trees planted, Glen Canyon Park was originally 76 acres of land from the Mexican land grant, Rancho San Miguel. The majority of residences that existed during this era were owned and operated by Swiss-dairy farmers, nicknaming the neighborhood "Little Switzerland".60

Between 1867 and 1869, the portion of the site occupied by the current recreational center and recreational fields operated as the first United States dynamite company, founded by Julius Bandman and known as the Giant Powder Company. Bandman secured exclusive licensing rights to the production of dynamite from its inventor, Alfred Nobel - future institutor of the Nobel Prize.61 As the site was far removed from the urban core of San Francisco and its burgeoning populace, the production of dynamite was rendered temporarily feasible in this remote outer-land. Shortly after business operations begun, the plant catastrophically exploded on November 60

61 Carey & Co Inc. Architecture, Historic Resources Evaluation, Glen Park Recreation Center, August 29, 2011, Pg 21
26, 1869, killing two people and injuring nine others while demolishing the entire one-acre complex\textsuperscript{62}.

![Figure 5.2 - Giant Powder Company Donkey with Dynamite\textsuperscript{63}](http://foundsf.org/index.php?title=Giant_Powder_Company)

Remaining unutilized for the following two decades, the canyon was purchased by the Crocker Real Estate Company in 1889 after the mass-transit San Francisco & San Mateo Railway (SF & SM Rail) was instituted, providing the feasible initiative for large-scale residential development. In an effort to attract homebuyers and accelerate lot sales, 


real estate company Baldwin & Howell constructed a small zoo and amusement park that offered free hot air balloon rides, a bowling alley, a miniature castle, and performances of a tightrope walker crossing the canyon. Cheap land combined with a kitsch attempt at entertainment intended to spark capital interest failed to attract homebuyers as intended, as a lack of basic public services within the neighborhood diminished residential interest.

Figure 5.3 - Glen Park Admission Day, September 1898

Following the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake, displaced residents set-up temporary shelters within the park and became the basis of the first members of the Glen Park community. The park however failed to capture the long-term investments of any further residents until the neighborhood's streets were paved in 1922 and new roadways

connected the area to its surrounding urban context. The neighborhood populace slowly diversified as downtown access was rendered feasible through various public transportation improvements, inevitably leading to increased residential development. Development grew rapidly until the 1929 Stock Market Crash, which halted the majority of private construction within the city and provided an opportunity for the City of San Francisco to purchase the Glen Canyon Park for public use and further development. The purchase of Glen Canyon Park prompted the development of its Recreation Center in 1938, and provided an area for the neighborhood's residents to gather, socialize, and engage in community-based activities.

5.3 – Building Description

Located at the southern end of the Glen Canyon Park and situated between O'Shaughnessy Blvd. and Elk Street, the recreational center is embedded within the heart of Glen Park's residential community. Designed by California architect William Merchant, the building opened for public use in 1938 and originally served as a space for club meetings, storytelling, games, handcraft projects, and theatrical and musical performances.

Spatially speaking, the recreational center is composed of an amalgamation of building forms and roof pitches that enclose a gymnasium, auditorium, stage, and offices within its single-story envelope. These different functions are formally articulated through the building's complex and incoherent massing, which is expressed amongst a variety of roof forms including gambrel, hip, and gable pitches. Exterior painted concrete walls encase a steel frame structure, and structural columns are accentuated by concrete pilasters along the gymnasium and stage areas. Functionally-speaking, the various community activities take place within the open floor plan of the recreational center's auditorium and gymnasium. No other space exists to permit community events, and the building has resultantly outgrown the needs of its user-base, possessing prime

---

opportunity to be redeveloped into a more integrated and socially-rooted community center.

Figure 5.5 - Author - Current Informal Community Activity Space

5.4 – Formal Opportunities

The building's complex massing creates an erratic arrangement of interior spaces that restrict any creative form of spatial redefinition without reducing an intervening strategy to selective retention and demolition. Arising from necessity, any attempt to attach more functions onto the existing building would foster a sense of "architectural schizophrenia" - an intervention strategy will only succeed if proper judgment is exercised in addition and subtraction. Amongst the complexities found throughout the
building, certain defining characteristics warrant opportune consideration and retention in any intervention strategy. These include the exposed steel trusses within the gymnasium's interior space and the steep, character-defining pitch of the “book-end” stage that faces out into the southern portion of the park. Furthermore, the various convergent roof forms offer a referential opportunity for a contemporary intervention. An effort to link the retained building elements together under one coherent roof has the ability to result in a successful, context-specific design strategy.

Figure 5.6 - Author - "Book-End" Exterior Stage Wall (Right)
5.5 – Community Context

Although Glen Park is embedded within the larger urban metropolis of San Francisco, the community is characterized by a quaint, village-like atmosphere, evoked through its two-block downtown and small-scale residential homes. Located at the intersection of Diamond and Bosworth St., the neighborhood center is composed of a variety of small, locally-owned shops and businesses.
A population of nearly 7,000 residents surrounds this commercial district, typified by all age groups. According to 2010 Census results, approximately 20% of the population are under the age of 18, and an equal 20% are over the age of 65. The primary bulk of residents are middle-aged, and the community is composed of families, retirees, and working professionals.
Figure 5.9 - Author - Youth Demographics
Figure 5.10 - Author - Senior Demographics
Employment Rates amongst the work force are between 94-96%, with 75-80% of residents working locally within the city of San Francisco.
Figure 5.12 - Author - Local Workers

Within the context of this middle-class, all-age neighborhood, there exists no alternate public venue for community gathering, engagement, and events. Resultantly, this responsibility has been undertaken by small businesses with a desire to pursue these opportunities, and poetry readings, art exhibitions, and live music tend to occur informally and without a sense of large-scale consistency. While it can be argued that these events add a certain characteristic to the neighborhood, they are ultimately limited
in size, scope, and potential. Through an incorporation of activities that respond to individual and community development, the social element of the Glen Park neighborhood can be better expressed and experienced amongst its populace with an expansion of its recreational center.

5.6 – 2012 Parks Bond

The 2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhoods Parks Bond allocated $12 million dollars to the renovation of the existing recreational center and its surrounding site. Supporting the goals of the 2011 Glen Park Community Plan, a key goal is to “secure the preservation and retention of the community's character through coherent design decisions”\(^\text{67}\). Underscoring Policy 3.3, which strives to protect Glen Park's historic character, the plan states that:

"Innovative architectural treatments and contemporary designs should not be seen as incompatible if carried out in a respectful manner."\(^\text{68}\)

Within this policy framework, a design intervention can be crafted which utilizes the merits of the existing structure, improves upon its multiplicity of shortcomings within a new contemporary setting, and expands upon the needs of its community through the creation of an established public gathering space which promotes the development of individual personalities and group cohesion through a new programmatic restructuring.


\(^68\) IBID, Pg. 13
CHAPTER 6
DESIGN PROCESS

6.1 – Program

In an attempt to best understand the utility of the existing building, the program
and spatial layout were analyzed and assessed in terms of accessibility and functionality.
Currently, a variety of activities for all age groups occur at the Glen Park Recreational
Center throughout different days of the week. The spatially-restrictive existing
configuration limits multi-functionality, constraining the building to single-use activities
that occur during their own individual time slots.

Figure 6.1 - Author - Existing Programmatic Analysis
Reconfiguring these programs within a framework conducive to the productive development of self and community, they were then organized in terms of three avenues of criteria: Education, Expression, and Experience. Serving as an intersection point between cultural production and cultural consumption, these thematic principles became a guiding force in the development and evolution of a new, more dynamic and responsive programmatic configuration for the redeveloped community center.

Figure 6.2 - Author - Proposed Programmatic Development

Intended to serve as a transmission of cultural capital, this expanded program possesses the ability to gestate a deeper sense of identity amongst the embedded community. Developed from an evolutionary framework centered upon an analysis of existing context and areas of opportunity, the proposal offers redesigned spaces for current activities, as well as an expanded focus on the creative education, expression, and experience of the community members.
6.2 – Conceptual Design Process

Driven by an expanded understanding of how a community center can better serve its populace, the conceptual design process was expressed through a series of model-making exercises that explored various formal opportunities for reintegrating the structure into its immediate context. A site model of existing conditions at 1/64" scale was first constructed to analyze the surrounding context within a physical format. Site entry points were examined, as well as topographical opportunities for building and landscape integration.
The decision to retain the existing form of the gymnasium, its associated structural columns and trusses, and the theater walls at the southern end of the site was based on both programmatic and spatial considerations given at the analytical stage of the design process, as discussed in Chapter 5 - Embedded Context. Serving as the base point for the conceptual design process, a number of study models were then crafted with formal and programmatic ideas articulated through attempts to embed the building within its surrounding landscape, connect to existing and proposed circulation paths, and retain elements of significance and potential within the existing building. Each successive model built upon the previous iteration, producing a chronological timeline of the formalized design process.
Figure 6.5 - Author - Study Model 1

Figure 6.6 - Author - Study Model 2
Figure 6.7 - Author - Study Model 3

Figure 6.8 - Author - Study Model 4
Figure 6.9 - Author - Study Model 5

Figure 6.10 - Author - Study Model 6
6.3 – Design Proposal

The final design proposal serves as a culmination of the various ideas being tested throughout the conceptual design process. An additional building wing is embedded within the terrain, following the topographical shifts which occur on the site's eastern edge and creating an accessible green roof which serves as an extension of the natural landscape. This wing extends from the building's central courtyard at an oblique angle, designed to intersect with the existing lower pathway and upper footpath while providing a walkable slope of 6.5%. This roof blends into the surrounding landscape and offers entry into the building's second story and rear performance area, while serving as a gateway for access further on into the park.

Figure 6.11 - Author - Locus Map
Figure 6.12 - Author - Site Plan (N.T.S.)
Figure 6.14 - Author - 2nd Floor Plan (N.T.S.)
The first floor plan is defined by a variety of art studios, workshops, and flexible activity spaces that permit existing programs to occur simultaneously throughout the building. In addition, a community kitchen and cafe space can serve as a food preparation area for large-scale events, as well as a food service counter for typical, daily operation. The remainder of the plan is composed of a large, double-height gallery and performance area, a reception desk for information and ticketing services, and a series of dressing rooms and storage spaces.

A double-height atrium space visually connects the first and second stories, and a small mezzanine that overlooks the main gallery and performance area offers an informal exhibition and lounge space. The second floor contains a multi-functional classroom and a large community space, available for group events, conferences, meetings, and presentations.

Within the building's main courtyard are a series of breakout workshop spaces and numerous seating areas, defined by a series of walls extending from the termination of the building’s exterior envelope. The rear of the building has a large exterior performance stage, characterized by a series of structural trusses which support a canopy extending from the roof. Generous seating arrangements allow for both formal and informal gatherings to take place. Easily accessible from the site's upper footpath, the building's interior connection, or the site's western edge, this area allows a communal gathering space for outdoor exhibitions, performances, and social events.
Figure 6.18 - Author - 2nd Floor - Upper Entry

Figure 6.19 - Author - 2nd Floor - Mezzanine

Figure 6.20 - Author - 2nd Floor - Multi-Functional Classroom
Figure 6.21 - Author - Exterior Courtyard

Figure 6.22 - Author - Exterior Performance Area
The interior ceilings of the building are influenced by the pitched slopes of the reconfigured roof lines. They draw the user through the building and craft a unique spatial quality within each room. Punctured by a variety of skylights on the second floor, the building maintains an exceptional level of natural daylighting, reducing cooling loads typically incurred by electrical lighting loads. Automated operability of these skylights provides the building with natural cooling, further reducing energy loads.

Figure 6.23 - Author - Sectional Perspective 1

Figure 6.24 - Author - Sectional Perspective 2
In the development of a facade screening system, multiple iterations were tested within Ecotect for environmental performance. Through the creation of a fully customized parametric script, variables such as density, depth, and spacing were controlled to produce an appropriate environmental response specific to the San Francisco site. The final selection performs well in both permitting natural light into the building interior, while minimizing excessive solar heat gains. The louver’s density and depth increases with higher levels of incurred solar irradiance along the building’s façade.

Figure 6.25 - Author - Facade Iteration 1

Figure 6.26 - Author - Facade Iteration 2
The selected facade iteration provides a gradient of louver density, decreasing the on-center spacing and increasing the louver depth in areas where solar irradiance is highest. A well-balanced distribution of interior light is achieved, providing even shading for all hours of the day.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

7.1 – Overview

The testing of a yet-uncovered potential for reimagining an existing and underperforming community center directed the gestation of this project's development from its inception onwards. Through the exploration of this vision, the final result is a more responsive and expressive community space that examines the concepts of education, experience, and expression within an existing space of vested history. As stated by Jonathan Hill:

"In architecture, habit, memory and experience are coupled with the sensual disembodiment of twentieth-century forms of communication to form a complex compound of spatial and temporal layers. Someone talks to you, caresses your back, while you listen to the phone, read the fax and peer out of the window. Architecture is experienced collectively and individually, each facet of a person reacting to a building and other people in distinct and maybe conflicting ways."

Both a building and programmatic renovation ensued - one in which physical elements of significance were retained, serving as the creative catalyst for the development of an expanded and reconsidered vision. The final product is an architecture that responds to its immediate context, supports and uplifts local relationships, and provides a fabric for the expression of the individual within a community-centered scale - an architecture whose significance is contingent upon the relationships it develops with the very users it has been crafted for.

CHAPTER 8

APPENDIX

8.1 - Transformative Process

Figure 8.1 - Author - Existing Conditions

Figure 8.2 - Author - Remove Conflicting and Incoherent Roofs

Figure 8.3 - Author - Remove Spatially Restrictive Wings
Figure 8.4 - Author – Re-Skin Retained Concrete Walls

Figure 8.5 - Author - Frame New Structural System Into Existing
Figure 8.6 - Author - New Programmatic Layout

Figure 8.7 - Author - New Façade and Shading System
Figure 8.8 - Author - New Roof

Figure 8.9 - Author - Completed Transformation
8.2 - Systems Axonometric

Figure 8.10 - Author - Full Systems Axonometric Diagram
8.3 - Final Model Images

Figure 8.11 - Author - Final Model - Top View
Figure 8.14 - Author - Final Model - Facade Detail

Figure 8.15 - Author - Final Model - West Elevation
Figure 8.16 - Author - Final Model - Rear Performance Area

Figure 8.17 - Author - Final Model - Performance Area and Site Context
Figure 8.18 - Author - Final Model – Rear Entrance and Interior Context

Figure 8.19 - Author - Final Model – Interior Gallery and Performance Area
Figure 8.20 - Author - Final Model - Accessible Roof and Upper Pathway
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