WORK BOOK:

IN COMMON

A Future for Student Housing at Moholt

This book is a loosely chronologically ordered collection of important steps of the design process. Made as tool alongside the process and not much edited in retrospect. Every step covered has had influence on the design, though not always equally clear. Often times the thoughts or ideas behind what is presented is as important for the final design as their physical manifestations.

The book is divided into three chapters, representing three phases of the design process. Although it is not always possible to clearly define in which phase any given step belongs, this gives a good representation of may way of working. The first phase, Widening Up, covers the initial design process up is an open mined presentation of ideas, possibilities, and an search to understand the fundamental design questions. The next phase, Specifying, starts to narrow down the findings proposing and developing a specific design concept. The final phase, Closing In, goes in depth on the actual design solutions of the main concept defined in the previous stage.

As especially the first phase produces a lot of highly different material this book holds from the initial design phases than the later ones, which are hugely about doing and redoing things until a good solution is reached.
PHASE 1: WIDEN UP
OPENING THOUGHTS

WHAT IS COLLECTIVE/STUDENT DWELLING?

TEMPORARY
FLEXIBILITY.
SOCIAL LIFE—AT HOME & OTHER AREAS?
PERSONALIZATION
FIRST OWN HOME/PLACE.

THE COLLECTIVE

SIZE?
SPATIAL ORGANIZATION
OWN/PRIVATE & SHARED/COMMON

WHAT IS NEEDED FOR A PRIVATE ROOM TO STAY IN?

TO INVITE PEOPLE IN?

WORK/STUDY?
READ?
WATCH A MOVIE?

WHAT DO YOU DO IN THE PRIVATE
WHAT DO YOU DO IN THE COMMONS

How much can I, as an
ARCHITECT, DIRECT THE
LIVES OF OTHERS, SHOULDN'T
MY SOLUTION FIT FOR
DIFFERENT PEOPLE?

ISN'T COLLECTIVE DWELLING MORE THAN
THE UNIT ITSELF?
“MINIMAL” UNITS

- No visitors
- No staying - just sleep/change
- The need for own toilet?
- Flexibility/personalization?
- Does it have to be limited to conventional (furniture/rooms/etc.)
- Would I like to live here?
- For how long?
CELL vs HOUSE$^2$
The first model in a series investigating the spatial organization of collective dwelling – not primarily form. This is a big student house arranged as a community around a central courtyard, outdoor or climatized. The whole community is facing inwards, much like Tietgenkollegiet. The circulation happens in the yard, from where you have a overview all over the house. Every floor has their own common areas, giving the residents their own smaller group to belong to.
+ small community focus
+ circulation makes for encounters
+ visual contact
+ has private, shared, common

- turns back to the greater student village
- institutional character, rooms like prison cells?
- no semi-private spaces
- usability of yard? too compact?
Private rooms as closed volumes. Common areas in between, protected from the outside only by a thin glass skin. The sleeping units are closed, clearly defined, private. At the same time the various common spaces are flowing between the volumes and have quite diffuse transitions as they are blending into each other and the more public outside.
+ circulation thru zones of common activity
+ difference private <> shared
+ student live in smaller units = more homey?
+ can branch, create inner yards, etc

- low density
- too much common area = too little intensity?
- few small spaces to be alone in shared areas
- how to navigate if the structure grows?
SiT kindly invited me to take part in a today’s workshop kicking off the new architectural planning competition for Moholt. Among the attendants were several people from SiT, representatives for the competing offices, students, and a wide range of other interests. The goal of the workshop was to kick start the competition by collectively imagining future wants and needs, brainstorming the site’s potential, generate initial ideas, and starting to find the right premises for the process.

Notes from the workshop:
Teams to compete:
- Fantastic Norway + Brendeland & Kristoffersen
- Rodeo + Architectopia + Lusparken + Landskaperiet
- MDH Arkitekter + Arne Henriksen Arkitekter
- Anne Lise Bjerkan + Moseng Poulsen Arkitektur + Erik Langdalen Arkitektkontor

Brain storming Moholt today:
large, international, sealed of/isolated from neighborhood, affordable, cheap, worn, old, well known, durable, dated?, under-used site, home for families with children, students don’t live here long, close to campus, close to nothing?, low status

Possible future trends/focuses for the new Moholt:
- focus on health and physical activity/sports
- time: save, use right, earn
- money: rent is ever rising so keep things cheap, offer what’s needed and every student can afford
- social: students wish to form relationships, build social networks, fell like they belong
- the village: make Mohholt a small community, offering everything needed in everyday life – jobs, shops, activities, services, hotel +++
- strengthen the reputation of Trondheim as a student city
- my student village: create a sense of ownership and identity among residents
Possible future users:
Families with children, kids, elderly, single parents, freshmen, internationals, long-term students, short-term students, organizations, neighbors, graduates, couples, religious groups, students, singles, members of groups, young students, older students

Possible future functions: (from competition program)

SiT will post a final program for their competition in about two weeks.

Note to self after workshop:
Remember - I’m doing a thesis project, not a competition entry. These are two parallel processes, but they should in no way be dependent on each other. I will not make myself meet the requirements of the competition, but rather be free to explore whatever I find right for the future of student dwelling at Moholt. As a student I maybe still have possibilities other than the competing teams?
Investigating more clearly defined levels of privacy / sizes of community. A clear hierarchy of spaces: nine private rooms enclosing a shared kitchen, four kitchens define a central common zone between all of them. This is a diagrammatic investigation, not an actual design!

+ Clear hierarchy
+ Smaller groups, possibly closer contact
+ Kitchens are interconnected

- Little chance of activity in central common room
- Introverted, turns back to student village
Domesticity in Seoul is no longer something that happens in the single place of the house. **Home is constructed by connecting different spaces spread out within the city.** It is not spatially fixed, unitary and consistent; but discontinuous, fragmented and constantly changing.

Homes tend to be thought of like places where conflict, diversity and collective are left behind to find familiarity and unpolitical calm. But a number of daily evidences could be seen as an opportunity to think homes as places where we get to meet and discuss with others. Shared homes are parliaments in which we get to share are living and confront with otherness.

Based on a five year research that explored all venues of domestic interiors, the pavilion draws from a number of different urban pockets that together represent the idea of ‘home’. They are largely driven by social networks and individually provide a spatial forum for meeting and discussion, such as a karaoke bar, a public sauna, and a cafe.

vimeo.com/28586784, archdaily.com/170133, designboom.com/architecture/andres-jaque-arquitectos-sweet-parliament-home-complete/
Are my ideas so far too much based on conventional solutions and existing perceptions about student dwellings? Each student, one room - then a shared space (kitchen).
How can I challenge this?
Do conventional rooms have to be the only solution?
The real needs aren't the rooms themselves, rather much more basic: You don’t need a sleeping room - you need one or more places to find privacy, security, retreat, sleep, have sex, cry... You don’t need a shared kitchen, you need to eat. The food you can get ready made, cook yourself or together with others. You need a social life - at home or elsewhere, and the needed amount is highly individual.

Basic needs to be met at home (in collective dwelling):
Security, privacy, sleep, social life/relationships, belonging, eating, hygiene, +++
Where are these needs met? < private - shared - common - public >
SOMETHING TO

SLEEP
DO SCHOOL WORK/STUDY
BE ALONE
CONTEMPLATE
CRY
INVITE FRIENDS
HIDE SECRETS
HAVE CONVERSATIONS
MEET PEOPLE
COOK
EAT
SURF THE WEB
WATCH A MOVIE
DO LAUNDRY
EXERCISE
READ A BOOK
PICK NOSE
BRUSH TEETH
SHAVE
CLEAN MYSELF
DO NOTHING
USE THE TOILET
LISTEN TO MUSIC
PLAY AN INSTRUMENT
SMOKE A JOINT
HAVE SEX
CALL HOME
MEDITATE
SHOP GROCERIES
+++
Collegi universitari / University colleges

Walter Gropius
Harvard Graduate Center
Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA
1950

Giancarlo De Carlo
Collegio del Colle
Urbino, Italia / Italy
1962-1966

Alejandro Aravena
St. Edward’s University
Austin, Texas, USA
2006-2008

Louis Kahn
Erdman Hall Dormitories
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, USA
1960-1965

camere
rooms
spazi di collegamento
connecting spaces
spazi comuni
communal spaces
bagni/servizi
toilets/services
Found a great graphic overview of selected student housing projects from the last eight decades. Very interesting to see the different approaches, clearly different ideas about what student dwelling is!
Scanned from the magazine Abitare #495 (01.09.2009)
Made these circulation diagrams to clarify some of the organizational differences between the projects. And they are fundamentally different! While some projects have common areas placed along or in the natural lines of communications, some place them more separately, yet others seemingly exclude these arenas all together.

Personally I believe projects like Simmons Hall and Baker Dormitory (the two to the left on this page) have a real strength in the closeness between private rooms and shared areas. This is what makes the common areas work, the residents don’t have to make a decision to visit them and then see if anything is happening, rather they encounter the activity in their daily routines.
"NETWORK"
INTERCONNECTED
MORE EQUAL ENTITIES
"RANDOM"

Complexity & contradiction.
Based on the preceding study of circulation, how can the thousands of student housing units at Moholt be connected in a bigger network? I believe there is a huge potential here. How can the different homes relate to each other? Do they interconnect and form one gigantic home network? Is the structure of this network random, flat, simple, complex, hierarchical, spatial, physical, psychological, or is it even real at all? Are there several individual housing networks or a single shared one?

The following investigation imposes several different network structures on Moholt. This is an open approach intended as a tool to evoke new connections, uncover possibilities, and tune the mind to understand Moholt as a network of student dwellings -any scale - physical or abstract.
Untitled letterpress work by Karel Martens, 1995
Sexual network structure, chlamydia outbreak in Colorado Springs
Based on photographic artwork by Gyorgy Kepes, 1930s
Connect the dots; children's game.
Moholt streets with house numbers chronologically connected
A network built up by the ever repeating addition and direct connection of common cells. The perimeters of the cell hold tiny personal spaces and connections to the neighboring cell. While the shape of every cell is the same they get different characters depending on their individual relationships with the surrounding cells.

+ Repetition of one element
+ Interesting spatial connections
+ Can grow infinitely
+ Rooms equal, but different

- All the same, hard to navigate
- Low density
- Introverted
Exploring the existing

Is it possible to make additions to the existing structures adding more floors? This could offer new possibilities for connecting the buildings, providing new kinds of common spaces, and obviously house more students. Today the buildings have 3,5 to 4 floors and do not appear very tall, largely thanks to the generous open green outdoor spaces. How to integrate? What could top extensions this look like?

Moholt meets Didden Village, MVRDV
Moholt meets Caixa Forum, HdM

Hovering horizontal box
Reflections
Are these pictures more than studies of form? Can new top floors join the houses in each row? This study shows that the buildings easily can handle more floors, but by doing this one should not only provide more units, but also offer something more? Form connections between houses - part of a network? Can new structures also connect the rows and single houses to each other? A physical network - all the buildings connected -> one huge building - one network... A new layer placed on top of the existing student village. Should be investigated on master plan level.

*If I extend the existing structures something new should be offered.* The existing structures have to bring new ways of using the original buildings - if not they are probably better of left alone. They have lasted 50 years as they are, why can’t they last another 50 years? The original Moholt standing, new

Also, there might be other ways of extending the existing structures. The plan layout today is extremely fixed, area effective and rooms are tightly packed together. It is not easy to do changes - this is likely the reason the buildings are still pretty much in their original state. Still, other ways of connecting to or transforming them should be further investigated.
Three things of interest in understanding Moholt student village and its structure: Dead end road system, generous green areas, vast parking lots.
Investigation of what it could be like if future growth at Moholt strictly followed the already established scheme. This is a starting point for the master plan development, but why not just do more of something that apparently works?

The approach immediately seems quite alright, but isn’t it a bit passive? Why is something that was right 50 years ago still right today? I should try to challenge the status quo more.
Notes and afterthoughts

-Set some reasonable numbers to work from, it’s easier to work towards something defined, concrete Also makes the project more real, makes it easier to compare different proposals, no reason to feel around.

-20m²/person. Including personal and shared space, no circulation etc. Anything more is likely to make things too expensive to construct, maintain, and will lead to too high renting prices for the student group.

-Level of utilization (utnyttelsesgrad): 150%. This is a high, but reasonable number. In the big picture Moholt is centrally located, relatively close to the city and campuses. Society has several expectations, one being densification. Moholt also represents a big potential for SiT for numerous units of housing - one that should be utilized.

-Who is going to live here? Now its mostly international students, which SiT has to offer accommodation, small young student families, and some early year students. Though living in the same student village, families and residents of the shared flats are not well integrated and seem to be living in different worlds, perhaps not too strange considering their different stages of life.

The trend among students without family or kids seems to be to move on from Moholt after a fairly short stay. They somehow find the situation inadequate in the long term. As they get to know the city, start to focus on the studies, make friends, or find love, there seek better options of housing. Though this in many ways is natural, Moholt as a student village would most likely gain tremendously in terms of social qualities if students chose to stay longer.
If Moholt is to grow a lot (which u150% implies) students not only have to stay longer at Moholt for the student village to work, it also needs to attract a more divers student population. This shouldn't be any problem as SiT still is far from meeting the demanded number of units. The main question of interest is what kind of architectural consequences a bigger, more diverse and longer staying student group will bring to my project?

The students are members of a highly diverse group. How do the different members fit at Moholt? How can i make it possible and desirable to move and stay there? Can I open up the possibility of couples in the collective? Do individuals have different needs or wished for their rooms? Single studying mothers? Young adults who just finished their studies? Larger families than one baby? The loner, the active, the party animal, the a-level student... what can they contribute?
Moholt by numbers:

Site: ~145 000 sqm  
Built: ~63 000 sqm  
Utilization: ~43%

Given a future goal of 150% utilization:  
  Added: 155 00 sqm

Number of new units:  
  ~6000  
  (approximation, 20sqm gross/pers, 80% gross/net, all new as housing)

Some potential additional functions:  
Sports center: ~ 2000 sqm up  
  (examples next page)  
Kindergarten: ~ 3000 sqm / 72 children  
  (Trondheim kommune)  
Grocery: 750 sqm up  
  (existing store)
Standard size swimming pool
315,5 sqm (12,5 m x 25 m)

Handball field
800 sqm (20 m x 40 m)

Olympic size swimming pool
1 250 sqm (25 m x 50 m)

SiT Gløshaugen sports center
~ 1 800 sqm ground floor
~ 45 m x 40 m

SiT Dragvoll sports center
~ 4 700 sqm ground floor
~ 76 m x 59 m

Pirbadet
~ 6 900 sqm ground floor
~ 120 m x 50 m

Nidarøhallen
~ 12 400 sqm ground floor
~ 110 m x 120 m
A spread out structure with private rooms as a wall between shared zones and outside. It gives the project form and can be envisioned as a one-floor wide-spread network (as seen in network investigations) organized along a long combined communication and living space, expanding as it turns and branches it’s way over a large area.

+ a system/structure
+ zones along communication

- navigating
Model investigating a clear 3 step hierarchical spatial organization.
1. My private room >
2. Our shared kitchen >
3. The common hall.
Spaces go from big to small, user groups from the large to the individual. A network branching out.
Compact, still distinct zones.

How much is really perceived as home?
Will it work?
What are the critical sizes (no of residents)
Open approach, exploring site thru plan sketches, getting the feel for the sizes.

**Discussions**
- Center vs no center (existing situation)
- What is a good size for new development?
- How to use existing buildings
- Time frame - how many units are needed today, in 5, 10, or 50 years? The master plan should include phases of development and has to be flexible enough to adapt to future unforeseen needs

**Master plan goals:**
As illustrated on the next page:
- Connect the student village with surroundings:
  - Connect green belt in north to rec
  - Match pedestrian and vehicle connections with surrounding infrastructure
  - Retail area
- Keep as much as possible of existing housing structures.
MAX FOOTPRINT, FILL THE GAPS

Reflections:
- Difficult building volumes
- Should shape the outdoor areas between houses better and more generous
- New main road
- Is this MOHOLT? (as we know it?)
- What about orientation?
  - are the areas distinct,
  - do you know where you are?
- Connecting to existing buildings
  - how can this be done?
  - Must be investigated at more detailed scale

New Building Area
5 floors avg
~ 90 000 m2 BTA
~ 3 600 units
+ sports center
+ kinder garten
GIVE SOME DISTANCE

Reflections:
- Shaping a center
- Is this keeping or changing Moholt’s character?
- Big volumes, long facades, institution?
- Scale new/old
- What’s left of the green belt?
- Outdoor spaces, differentiation, sameness?

New Building Area
5 floors avg
~ 70 000 m^2 BTA
~ 2500 units
(doubling)
+ sports center
TURNING URBAN

Reflections:
-City-like blocks
-Public functions centrally located
-Starting to create zones of different intensity
-Integration with Moholt and landscape?
-Parking along roads
MAIN STREET MOHOLT

Reflections:
- Directions from landscape and existing buildings.
- Navigate along street
- Am I getting there?

New Building Area
5 floors avg
~ 87 000 sqm BTA
~3400 new units
+ sports center
+ kindergarten
MEGA STRUCTURE

Reflections:
- Connecting the dots (existing)
- A physical manifestation of a social network?
- All residents belong to the same home.
- Mi casa es su casa!
- Usability?
- Can much of the same be achieved without it being one building?

New Building Area
~ 140 000 sqm BTA
~5 500 new units
+ sports center
+ kindergarten
GOING WIDE

Reflections:
- Making the dots
- A carpet of small scale structures
- All equal, all different

New Building Area
~ 1140 boxes
4 x 4 m, two floors
= 36500 sqm
~4000 new units
+ sports center
+ kindergarten
MODEL 1:500:
CARPET HOUSING

24.01.13
Modelling the idea of a village of small houses. Each house a collective, relating to its neighbors. Though a lot of obvious practical concerns there is something truly appealing about this approach. It expresses both individuality and community/collective qualities in a beautiful manner. Also it moves communal life to outdoor spaces, where the whole student village becomes one collective! I think this model carries a lot of interesting things to bring along in the further development of the project.
The student village lies quietly covered in white by last night’s snow fall. Paths have appeared where people have been walking this morning, crossing the open areas between the houses on their way to school.

Winter makes Moholt beautiful. Black and white birch trunks are rising from a soft carpet of fresh snow making the red brick houses stand out. Today it seems clear how any future additions would have to respect this precious relationship between landscape and buildings.
- Urbanization. The student village turning into a student town.
- Directions from landscape and existing buildings.
- Navigate along street
- Am I getting there?

**New Building Area**
4,5 floors avg
~ 92 000 sqm BTA
~3700 new units
+ sports center
+ grocery
no kindergarten
SiT has released the program for their competition Moholt 50|50. Even if I’m not to answer to this with my project, it holds some interesting considerations and background for my further work:

Main question: How to create an attractive, exiting, and robust student village at Moholt?

About surroundings:
- NTNU Dragvoll might move closer to city center
- The greater Moholt area is planned to continue developing into a local centre - core being existing retail area close to E6.
- Future more city-like character: Urban qualities, streets rather than roads, street-facing program and public functions.

The student village:
Site: ~ 145 000 sqm / BTA ~ 63 000 sqm / Use ~ 43%
- Existing old trees are a quality (perhaps especially the avenue - Moholt Allé?)
- Little needs for car parking, high demands for bicycle facilities.

Goals:
- The area is to be developed over the course of several years. The project needs a strong main intervention that is adaptable to future change and strengthens the identity of the student village.
- Moholt should meet the needs of a wide range of users, not only students. This group will change throughout the course of the day, week, year, and even in a longer time frame.
- Dense development opens several possibilities for future urban development, i.e. larger part of the area can be used for other things than student housing.
- The plan should include a mix of functions: student housing, private housing, kindergartens, sport facilities, common areas, and possible business functions.
- Common areas/facilities exceeding the shared areas of the housing must be financed through development and sale of private housing/business areas.
-The student village requires kindergarten(s). Immediate need of 220 places (~2700 sqm + outdoor areas).
-SiT estimates a need of about 1600 student housing units until 2020

**Estimated BTA/unit: 30 sqm**

-Time frame for the whole development: 10-20 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Byggeår</th>
<th>Hybler</th>
<th>Hybler 2-koll</th>
<th>Par-leiligheter</th>
<th>Familie-leiligheter</th>
<th>Antall HE</th>
<th>Antall SBE</th>
<th>Voksne beboere</th>
<th>Barn</th>
<th>Beboere totalt</th>
<th>Brutto-areal m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byggetrin 1 [HK]</td>
<td>1962-66</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>33 376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moholt barnehage</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nissekollen barnehage</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kontor/forretning</td>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalt</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>62 833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) HK = Herman Krags veg  
2) HA = Moholt Alle og PK= Prestekragevegen  
3) HE = hybelenheter: 1 hybel = 1 HE, 1 parleilighet = 2 HE, 1 familieleilighet = 2,5 HE (0,5 HE tilsvarer ett barn)  
4) Barnebeboere: Regner ett barn i gjennomsnitt pr leilighet  
5) SBE = Storbarnsekvivalenter i barnehagene

**Moholt today**  
*from competition program*
A few weeks ago I did a short study of different approaches if extending the existing buildings upwards. These were not intended as actual designs, but rather as quick investigations of possibilities of different approaches. Of the 5 previously studied proposals I personally clearly prefer the one based on Caixa Forum in Madrid (picture next page). I have to admit I think this is largely based on looks, more than any particular idea of how to work with the existing, thoughts on spatial organization, or the idea of the student village as a network. But still that should give a hint of the right approach to this buildings? (If I in the end am to extend them) What exactly is it that I find visually pleasing about the particular proposal? I like that it is connecting the existing using a similar scale, broken into several smaller volumes rather than one big structure forcing a horizontal connection on top of the volumes. As previously stated this is not intended as an actual design, it is more an approach, a way of working with the existing. Still it might be hard to clearly judge as such. But how much is the fondness for this proposal based on similarity of color between corrugated steel and red brick? What if the color was complementary (copper) or more neutral gray (aluminium)?

Just by changing the color of the top extensions one gets a quite different feeling of them. They do not connect in the same way to the existing, but are more clearly something different added on top. Still I believe the previous thoughts on volumes and dimensions stand true.

If I choose to extend the existing buildings upwards, these findings will be taken into account. Extensions to the existing buildings - how I work with them in general - has to be further investigated with architectural drawings and models. The extensions do not only have to be adding floors, but can also include building next to - as suggested by some of the master plan proposals.

Note: It is not clear if the existing buildings can take more floors, still this discussion is of interest for a student project. If top extensions should become a main strategy, this would need attention, but at this open stage of the process the studies and their findings are of interest, as they anyway provide clues to the bigger question of how to work with the existing
Notes and afterthoughts
-Master plan:
  - Connecting to surrounding areas (green + roads) - good. Points of connection will be important.
  - At this point anything between 50 000 sqm ans 100 000 sqm additional student housing seem reasonable (~2000-4000 units). This is still very open and will depend on later findings. How much can the area take, what’s the time frame, what’s needed etc.
  - Let design of housing form master plan
  - Moholt’s character today is largely the relationship between landscape and houses. This is a quality, how do I handle this? Enforce/contrast/erase?
The carpet master plan (horizontal) raised vertically. Two floor boxes with personal sleeping units, shared kitchens in gaps between boxes. Each level of boxed directly connected to a gap on other side of central circulation. Half floor alternation between boxes, both between the two sides and along the two rows. Middle stair filled communication space - not an actual design, but with stairs highlighting the relationship between private rooms and respective kitchens.
12.02.13

Ideas

derived from existing structure

private
private
common
private
private
private + common

private boxes
common gaps

ref:

(horizontal arrangement)

possible elevation
Cleaning up the last model, trying to be less boxy, but use the idea of private room as a building block

- Two “walls” of rooms, circulation big gap between
- Boxes of different sizes = different rooms/units/users
- Half floor shift between the two sides would allow for interesting connections of common spaces and interesting relations to private rooms.
- Holes in the two walls as shared areas.
REFERENCE PROJECT:
HAVE A NICE DAY!
Student Housing Competition, Toronto, Canada
We Are You

-One single continuous **vertical living room** flows through the whole building
-Small private spaces, opens for more generous common areas
-Dense, urban setting
-Different activities on every floor
-Public facilities ground floor - city meets housing
Notes and afterthoughts

- My process is about doing and investigating alternatives, not sitting and waiting for a brilliant idea. Good, stay in control and direct the process.
- Don’t be afraid to stay in this open zone, I find out a lot. Several things seem to be going on, but they will all come together nicely - later.
- Seems more productive to focus on the dwellings/ private vs common in student housing than to spend time on the master plan, it gets too general. I find out more by looking more closely at the housing, eventually this will inform the master plan.
- Several interesting ideas/concepts are emerging. They could all work, continue investigation.
- Two main trends:
  1: A wide, spread out approach, repetition of similar volumes, interwoven network, no hierarchy.
  2: Denser blocks, stronger hierarchy of spaces/several levels of interaction.
- Limiting private space: allows for larger common areas. 20 sqm/person isn’t that small after all - compare to space per person in a typical family dwelling.
- Midterm: Do I want to present a few different concepts and discuss/compare these approaches OR do I present one (decided upon) concept more in detail and discuss that more deeply?
I want to keep down the size of the individual units in order to save space for use in common areas. But how much is needed of a private space? There is no absolute answer, the needs will be highly individual, is there anything such as the minimal (area-wise) student unit?

Coming as fresh student to Trondheim. Few belongings. Small or no social network. First own home. Expectations, impressions. A private place to retreat. This is mine. My place. Protected, underground.
I’ve read an article in Architectural Review’s series called The Big Rethink. Along several other interesting discussions on what makes a good place, the author has some particularly relevant considerations for my development of the student village:

“Remember though that place rarely, if ever, has to be created from scratch. Instead it starts as a response to place, to what is local and pre-existing, enhancing and even intensifying the genius loci of both site and setting, as well as relevant factors in what might be a large hinterland; place is also a lasting legacy to be patinated with the overlays of time, use and memory. Thus creating place starts with sensitive attention to what is there”

I must not forget the existing qualities of Moholt in my work. As previously stated Moholt has some strong modernistic characteristics - repetition of identical units, no defined center, buildings spread out in landscape. Although somehow different from today’s ideals, these are none the less the qualities that constitute Moholt, wouldn’t it make sense to strengthen these qualities, not work against them?

Buchanan goes on:
“Design tends to cement relationships with elements in the surroundings, often resulting in novel relationships between these, while also bringing into visible focus the myriad forces – from climatic to cultural, economic to land use – that shape or act on the site and location. This is a very different dynamic to the sort of passively parasitic contextualism that merely tries to fit in [...] these strategies tend to sap character and vigour rather than adding them to place. Instead of such parasitism, a designer might explore the many forces impinging on site and setting and seek to resolve them in a synergetic synthesis, as the essential nutrients for a design that is rooted in place and manifests as its ultimate flowering. Or the designer might ask, when drawing on all these same forces and factors, what would the earth or evolution dream into being here?”

The solution is not to try to fit in, ultimately the future Moholt should draw on both existing and potential qualities, evolving from the past and existing into the future.
Illustration from the article:
“Paul Klee’s ‘Blossoming’ depicts in an abstract composition how nutrients in the surrounding moist earth feed and are fulfilled by the opening flower – an example of how buildings may draw on and fulfil their context”

Article Source:
Like Klee: How can Moholt draw on the existing context to generate the future student village?
Axial organizations

Private rooms as equal entities along one big common living room
-too direct connection? no transitions? where do I belong?

Private rooms around separate common areas connected to each other
-clear where I belong, but am I welcome to the neighbors?

Private rooms connected to a sequence of common areas, merging into one.
-each room relates to a specific space, which flows into the next

As over, but with some shared functions as quiet “pockets” along the sequence.
I’m back researching the idea of the courtyard, this time much much bigger than the earlier model. Mega collective that makes it very clear what’s private, shared, and common. Is there a sense of community? A system that could be applied in a number of ways to suit different locations of the student village.
EVERYTHING I KNOW
OR THINK I KNOW THIS FAR

- Minimize private space + more common areas.
- Private spaces are private, a personal retreat, less blending with common space.
- Avoid institutional-like spaces (scale/repetition/sameness)
  Home is traditionally a smaller scale.

- The network.
  Non-hierarchical structure. Not a pyramid of spaces,

[Diagram of interconnected network]

The molotted network.
Not only physical - also an idea/motion, a mental network, feeling part of the same.

- Keep building - landscape relationship.
- How to work with existing?
A grandchild of the carpet master plan. Relationship of boxes. Personal rooms as boxes, common spaces between. Shaping space with space. Several different zones, for different activities, moods, personalities, size of groups, Two plus two floors, each pair a collective. Common space partly double height. Model shows two alternative configurations, giving two different facades.
different spaces, different light
Facade A
Same configuration of boxes on all floors. Verticality, almost towers. Box-gap-box-gap-box. Nice rythm! Communicates well with existing buildings of both development stages.
Facade B
Alternating configuration of boxes. More messy. Boxes are more individual. I live in that one! More home, less institution? Less buildable than alternative A.
Just saw a video interview of Japanese Architect Sou Fujumoto done by Oris Magazine. During the more than one hour long interview Fujimoto discusses his thoughts on and approach to architecture. Fujumoto touches upon many of the same subjects I already have been considering in my project, and I think there is a lot of considerations here that can prove really useful for me to bring along in my further work.

On approach:
Architecture is used by people, and I like to start from that basic point. And people are for me somehow primitive, because we have a body, we have kind of an animal-like body, we have instincts. Of course we are not animals, but our behavior, our relationship between the space and the body could be very very primitive, I think. So when I think about the future I like to start from such a basic fundamental point, go back to that really fundamental point and then think what is an architecture, what is a space, or what is a place for people to live?

On hierarchy:
I think the nonhierarchical space is one of the very interesting points for me, [...] I like to create some kind of say a dense space, less dense space; more of a gradient situation. Recently that has been more interesting. Then people can select, the dark space or the more open space, a kind of a landscape-like situation. [...] Then we can recreate a kind of new concept of space. I think forest-like spaces are interesting for me. The forest has many trees. It’s like a non-hierarchy, it has kind of different areas, different spaces in it. So the spaces are nonhierarchical, but not equal.

On flexibility:
Architecture is itself a very huge constrain, even if we can, say move some sliding doors or something, the whole area is strictly defined by the architectural system. [...] Architecture is not flexible; I like to start from that point. Architecture is very strong. We couldn’t change such a very fundamental point. But if you’re flexible in your mind then you can behave according to your situation, or according to how many people you are with, or such kind of things. So it’s kind of a drastic change of attitude. Flexible is not kind of moveable things, but flexible is the flexibility of relationship between the space and your body.

youtube.com/watch?v=5Igyi65DRv8
This is the treatment center for mentally disturbed children where they live together to get regaining their mental health. It may be thought that it is a very special building when I write so, but it is truly rich life space that requested in origin like a large house and also like a small city, the intimacy of a house and also the variety of the city. This is a proposal of a loose method.

The method of being random
A precise planning / Accidental landscape
If it was possible to make a building with such a method how something was merely scattered, I thought it was a dreamlike building. And, as for this method, surprisingly precision planning is possible. As opposed to the complicated program called for, moving a box delicately, the plan can be flexibly packed just because it is random.

However, the first feature of this method is over there.
Although, this space is created as a result of an infinite, strict and artificial design process, it stands as a place which is not planned at all, or which has been made automatically with no intention. The place which is vague, unpredictable, filled with unlikelihood. Something that is not meant is produced as a result of an intentional and strict design act. And plenty of a place is achieved because of ambiguity for not being intentional.

Selectivity and contingency / freedom and inconvenient
A surely irregular alcove-place is produced between the boxes placed at random. It is the place of a small scale where children can hide in while they are connected to the living area. Although it is the space with no function in which it can make it avoidable in a simple form strangely, children play with the place like the primitive man who interprets landscape freely and lives very well in it. They hide in a place behind something, show up, relax at back, and run about here and there. By being separated and being connected are compatible, freedom and inconvenient live together in the meantime. Plenty of the place for living is achieved.

It can be said that there is nothing center here and conversely, it can be said that there is a countless center. They are “relative centers” which always interchanges and changes with the consciousness of those who are there or the condition of light. For the staff, a staff room is a functional center. For children, living room, a single room, or an alcove is a center. The occasional center is found out in fluctuation of space.

archdaily.com/8028/children’s-center-for-psychiatric-rehabilitation-sou-fujimoto/
As part of the project I have to take a stand in what to do with the existing houses. Will I create an A- and B- team if I do not upgrade them alongside the new buildings I will bring? Or do I want to change them just for change’s sake? This is bothering me a bit at the moment. I wish to find a concept that is embracing the existing houses, making them an integral part of the new Moholt I’m planning.

However, the existing structures are a real challenge. They have remained mostly unchanged for 50 years, the reason might be that they actually work quite well, or it might be that it’s simply too difficult to make any significant change. The structures are pretty much tight and locked at their current state.

Which strategy should be chosen for these houses?
One strategy I investigated earlier, but have to admit also abandoned was the idea of new separate satellite houses connected to the existing ones through elevated walkways. The existing houses would be a common hub with kitchen and shared living areas, whereas the new additions would hold private zones.

Whatever form these satellites might have there is a real challenge in the limited space around the existing and how one could connect without loosing qualities for these.

I also believe the outdoor middle ground between the new and old would be a problematic area, but this can not be concluded without a more detailed design exercise of these.

The main challenge however, is that i do not se how one could create good common spaces for bigger groups in the small rooms of the existing.

I feel I’m working against the existing, not with it.
connecting to existing
(more units/kitchen)

existing vs
new

Who's

connected to

new connectivity
to existing

saekles
This is a strategy that I believe somewhat more in, but it still has a lot of challenges. The intent is to connect existing houses (primarily within the rows) with each other through the addition of a new top floor. Thus every house would be interaccessible.

This implies common spaces on in the new top floor – is this a good strategy if I want to activate the student village and encourage life between the houses?

Though the form of the possible additions is a challenge, this is not the main one, I doubt how well it will actually work and if considering cost/gain one could seriously start to question the whole approach.

Still there is something in me not willing to give up yet. But I find it a real struggle to work out a good strategy for changing the status quo. Maybe I just feel I ought to do something, that this is part of the task, while the structures say no?
Section: One house collective
Existing houses at moment.

Problems (according to sit):
- Accessibility
- Energy use

What about social life?

1 house = 1 community

What's the gain?
- less usable area
- more people to share kitchen

Money invested vs gain?
an extra floor to existing rows.
- one house kitchen.
  - why would anyone want that?
  - will up 3 floors to get to the kitchen
  - a connection between all the houses.

house a

change for charges

do the buildings ever get better - really?
PHASE 2: SPECIFYING
Concept:
The chosen approach looks good, continue work on this one. Wouldn’t have come here without board, open investigations to start out. The project has references to several different early investigations.

Master plan:
This seems a better approach - relating to and drawing upon what’s already there. Using landscape, road side + green side. Main connection point very important. The main meeting point between student village and surroundings.

Housing:
Looks good. Define entrance zones. Vertical communication and contact between floors/openings. Work with spaces between boxes. Do students need hits on how to use the space - not just open furnishable space, but more programmed? Work on sizes, make usable zones.

Private rooms: Continue to work out a set of boxes - single, couple, accessible, family.... Different need for private space for students of different stages: Ex: first year single student with no network vs late year couple or small family. Some groups might need to be alone together.

Shared/common boxes: Other functions than kitchens? Can common boxes have an other appearance/look/material/etc. than the more private boxes?

Further work:
Zoom in on a specific area, design a project there for midterm presentations.
I have already come far – why not look into the design of the sport facilities as well? Kindergartens – should develop some thoughts/ideas on what this should be in a student village (as opposed to elsewhere.) Not a design, but more than just locating.
Slaap
souvenir/approche coche print
Wow can this idea be incorporated in the student village? Connecting and creating collectives with existing buildings? Zooming in on collective connection to family house on central parking lot.
Collectives stretching in the landscape.
Defining a main entry point for Moholt.
2500 units,
Buildings laid out by the principle of one side green, one side road,
New buildings as barriers?
I chose to present my process so far for the midterm presentation, focusing mostly on the later development the past few weeks. The following pages show new material from the presentation, followed by the received feedback.

**TASK**

Through design investigate the collective student dwelling as type by transformation and densification of the existing Moholt Student Village.
Follow landscape
  Relationship road - buildings - landscape
  Buildings along/perpendicular to contours

Connect to surroundings
  roads
  green
  centre
  view points

Create a center

Public functions
  Kindergartens
  Sports center
  Grocery
  Activity house
  Bus stop
  Other uses?

Doubling number of housing units

Phases of development
Focus on common areas

Personal rooms
- In volumes
- Space efficient
- Fixed furniture
- Standardized types
- Different units to suit personal needs

Common areas
- Between the volumes
- Circulation and living
- Encounters

Connecting to existing, becomes a part

Flexibility
- Hierarchy?
- Programming of the in-between spaces
- Built in furniture in walls of boxes?

Vertical connections
- 25 sqm BTA/person

Materials
ACCESSIBLE / COUPLE’S UNIT
20 sqm, 2 beds, Wheelchair accessible, Private living zone

ACCESSIBLE SINGLE UNIT
12 sqm, 1 bed, Wheelchair accessible
PRIVATE ROOMS

Types to suit students of different stages, needs, wishes

Varying scopes of private spheres

All have
  - bathroom
  - work space
  - sleeping space
  - storage

FAMILY UNIT
29 sqm, 3 beds, Wheelchair accessible, Private living room

SINGLE UNIT
9 sqm, 1 bed

SINGLE UNIT
10 sqm, 1 bed
My notes and summary of the midterm feedback:

Cits: Fredrik Shetelig, Barbra Matusiak, Ole Jørgen Bryn

Be clear on main priority, both in presentation and design implications. Densification? The social aspects?

The student’s life. They are not a homogeneous group. Different stages, personalities, wishes, needs. Reflect on these realities. Give this discussion a clear structure - it’s absolutely crucial for the project. What are the real questions to be answered architecturally? A reflection has to form the basis. Go deep. This should be investigate, reflected on and presented as a starting point.

The project is romanticizing the idea of the common, social life. Being together always is not always good. People need to be able to be alone, a fundamental aspect of living. Find the balance. I can be social, but I don’t have to! What is social life at home? What kind of community should I offer? Reflect.

Common life does not just have to happen inside the buildings! Think urban! City like spaces, the life between the houses. Main places to meet are often not inside! Studentby = student city. Social living in public spaces. Life in a gradient between private and public.

Master plan. Think city! Work with a clear hierarchy, different spaces / zones / areas, not all the same! What are the goals of the master plan? Be clear! Densification? Change character, keep character, new qualities? New public functions could work like a generator for the greater area. Connect not just like a representative space, but like a living public spaces, focus on this particular one as the urban space of Moholt. High rise vertical marker? Who are the users, residents or people from outside as well?
Family dwellings <> single units
Very different stage of life, what are their real differences in needs / wishes? Can or should they live together?
Partying vs sleeping children +++. The life styles are fundamentally different, not necessarily compatible. This should be clear in master plan (as it is at Moholt today)

About kindergartens - the current locations are not convincing. Why are they there, seems to happen by chance. Take a active decision. Where do they fit on the fabric? Where do people come from and where are they going? Infrastructure. Who are they for?

How to work with the transitions/boundary between the student village and the surroundings? Define the periphery. One strategy would be to build along the outer edges to define the student village more clearly. A separate entity, NOT part of the surroundings. An own world. Does not necessarily have to be blended in....

I work both fomalistic AND structuralistic - can the structure generate the form?

Do I want to just densify Moholt OR actually change it as well?

How to proceed:
1: Go one step back to typology, investigate, define. What should the buildings do, how should they work.
2: Proceed to form, actual design. What should it look like.
Notes from midterm feedback by Hanne:

- Strategi for å velge.
- Hva har du valgt og hvorfor?
- Prioritering. Fortetting / sosialt nettverk.
- Parkering. Bil?
- Synner, synneveger
- Vegetasjon. Park med hus i.
- Untersøkelse av sosialehvaleteter i boligmiljøet.
- Fantasi rundt jellesskap. Hva er FELLESKAP?
- Hva er studentens liv?
- Hva er det reelle behovet for jellesskap?
- Strukturere behovet.
- Bruke jellesskapsbøker mer konstruktiv.
- Administrere 3D jellesskap. Dyrtræt
- Hærskaper.
- Private/offentlige rom, friske
- Konstentre.
Definere rom, mye bygningsmass. Generere aktivitet til tyngdepunkt. \( \text{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet} \)

Topphiereti - Felleskapets rom.

Boulevard West 8. 3 etg. bygning.

Bry. Bornburg, 1940-tallet, Amsterdam.

Felleskap, hvem er studenten? Hvordan lever det? Hvordan lever det?

Hva slags romsyn, undersøkelser i bunn?

Hvordan administrere rom, konstruksjon, hierarhi etc?

Hvor er spesielt sted? Slik det ut?

Er det nysete i hattene?

Hvor som tydeligere sted, Perikl. JEG KAN, MEN JEG SKAL IKKE!

Hva med de introverte studentene?

Alle er ikke snill med hverandre!

Gli et gammel tabak, typologi, felleskap og hva er studentens liv.

Formalismen med struktur og systematisk med struktur. Form.

Struktur - logikk.

Hva slags type felleskap burde du kunne tidy.

FORM D TYPOLOGI D FORM.
Good to be back day after midterm. Need to connect again, understand the fundamentals of the village.

Things thinking about today:
-Do you ever look out?
-Same, same, but different.
-The sun always shines on TV
I’m doing student housing, so who exactly am I designing for? Who are the students?

Obviously students are not a homogeneous group, they are all kinds of people! Still there exists some kind of common understanding of a typical student: someone in their early twenties, full time student, living in a shared flat, and never returning to education after the degree is finished. Though this description obviously fits for quite a large part of the students, it is far from the total picture. The student group is getting ever more diverse and blending more and more with society in general. This is true when it comes to differences in age, ethnicity, relationship status, personal economy, and a range of other background factors. A number of students are working part time, or may even take a shorter or longer break form studies to work in order to earn money, gain experience or just do something different.

In addition to being too narrow on basic demographic facts, the typical view also fails to consider the diversity between students on a level of unique personalities, interests, aspirations, and life styles. These individual qualities are far harder to measure than pure demographic facts differences, but are probably of even greater importance. This is obvious, who you are is much more than what can be measured statistically. Students are extroverts and introverts, active and lazy, happy and depressed, contact seeking and shy, meat-lovers and vegetarians – the list could go on forever. These individualities can in no way be said to be particular for students, in the end they mirror society in general.
The time when one is a student is included in what Frønes & Brusdal (2000) describe as the young-adult phase, a phase that is characterised by the way young people live: without established families, and searching for ideals, friendship and new experiences. The young-adult phase has become a prolonged period in life and the field of Sociology of Youth defines it more according to living circumstances, interests and needs than according to age (Mayer 2002). **Nowadays, the time spent on education and living alone is a period that stretches from leaving the parental home and up to the establishment of one’s own household.** Becoming a student is the reason why many young people in Norway move to a new city and leave the parental home. This is a period where new definitions of social interaction and living conditions are required and own decisions have to be made. Finding accommodation is one important part of this process.

–Judith Thomsen (2008), Student Housing - Student Homes?
So what are the students’ personalities? What do their days look like? These seven examples are based on and expanded from SiT’s classification of student types. Obviously these stereotypes do not cover all (or perhaps not even any) students. This is a simplification, unable to catch a range of individualities. As always generalizing comes with danger. Still this exercise highlights a few common trends and that can be very useful in thinking about the different housing needs among students. Which personality types am I designing for?
**The Involved**

- **Age:** Early twenties
- **Main trait:** Engaged
- **Friends:** In same organization
- **Work:** Volunteer
- **Housing preference:** Centrally located
- **Needs:** More time
- **Transportation:** Bus
- **Save the world**

**Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600:</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900:</td>
<td><strong>Wake up</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000:</td>
<td><strong>Lecture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100:</td>
<td>Uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200:</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300:</td>
<td><strong>Volunteer work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400:</td>
<td><strong>Lecture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600:</td>
<td><strong>Group study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700:</td>
<td><strong>Volunteering</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800:</td>
<td>Student Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900:</td>
<td><strong>Dinner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000:</td>
<td><strong>Socializing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300:</td>
<td><strong>Self study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400:</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100:</td>
<td><strong>Bedtime</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**The International**

- **Age:** Mid twenties
- **Main trait:** Different
- **Friends:** Other exchange students
- **Work:** No
- **Housing preference:** Cheap, with others
- **Needs:** Close to school
- **Transportation:** Bus
- **Study abroad**

**Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600:</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900:</td>
<td><strong>Wake up</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000:</td>
<td><strong>Lecture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100:</td>
<td>Uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200:</td>
<td><strong>Group study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300:</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400:</td>
<td><strong>Lecture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600:</td>
<td><strong>Group study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700:</td>
<td><strong>Relaxing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800:</td>
<td><strong>Self study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900:</td>
<td>Skyping home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000:</td>
<td><strong>Shared dinner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100:</td>
<td>Friend's place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400:</td>
<td><strong>Watch a movie</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100:</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200:</td>
<td><strong>Bedtime</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Active

Age: Mid-twenties
Main trait: Ambiguous
Friends: Team mates
Work: During weekends
Housing preference: Close to nature and gym
Storage sports equipment
Bicycle
Run

Schedule:
0600: Wake up
0700: Exercise
0800: Lecture
1000: Lunch
1200: Self study
1400: Lecture
1500: Skiing
1600: Dinner
1800: Self study
2100: Socializing
2400: Bedtime

The Overly Social

Age: Late Twenties
Main trait: Outgoing
Friends: Everyone
Work: No
Housing preference: With anyone
Contact with others
Walking
Hang out

Schedule:
0600: Wake up
1000: Lecture
1200: Lunch date
1400: Lecture
1600: Self study
1700: Exercise
1900: Dinner party
2100: Call friend
2400: Relaxing
0100: Bedtime
0200:
The High Class

**Age:** Mid Twenties
**Main trait:** Self-centered
**Friends:** Rich boys, beautiful girls
**Work:** No
**Housing preference:** Central, large, high standard
**Needs:** Nothing, has it all
**Transportation:** Personal car
**Party**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule:</th>
<th>Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000:</td>
<td>Wake up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100:</td>
<td>Late to lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200:</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300:</td>
<td>Group study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400:</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600:</td>
<td>Self study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700:</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900:</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100:</td>
<td>Home party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200:</td>
<td>Bedtime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Parent

**Age:** Late Twenties
**Main trait:** Responsible
**Friends:** Young families
**Work:** Yes, to make ends meet
**Housing preference:** Large, outdoor play area
**Needs:** Several bedrooms
**Transportation:** Personal car
**Raise kids**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule:</th>
<th>Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700:</td>
<td>Wake up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800:</td>
<td>Drop off kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900:</td>
<td>Self study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000:</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200:</td>
<td>Self study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300:</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400:</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600:</td>
<td>Pick up kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700:</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800:</td>
<td>Kids’ sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000:</td>
<td>Kids to bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100:</td>
<td>Relaxing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200:</td>
<td>Self study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400:</td>
<td>Bedtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Trend

The diagram to the left shows all the seven student schedules overlaid. The result is a surprisingly clear general trend, but not a conclusion. As already stated the average student does not exist, thus neither a common average schedule. Still it is interesting to note that the seven different schedules together form a clear pattern. Though in no way not absolute, the diagram highlights these already known general patterns:

- School is an important social arena
- Students often take part in organized activities
- Relatively little time spent at home
- Much of social life takes place outside home

This finding underlines the assumption that most students despite different personalities, interests, and diverse demographic background (as shown on the next page) share some strong characteristic simply due to their main occupation.

Note:
The diagram probably under communicates the time actually spent at home. Very few students go the entire day from they leave for school until they go to bed without at least stopping by at home. Also, the socializing sector typically takes place in someone’s home, making it part of domestic life.
Plot of the seven student types assumed demographic data. If anything this representation shows that there are few clear patterns to be found. This is not what defines a student.
So, what makes the student special?
As illustrated so far students represent a big and highly diverse group still typically sharing some general characteristics besides the obvious fact of occupation:
- young adults
- not yet settled down
- defining own identity
- establishing own household
- making of social network
- limited financial resources
- sees own housing situation as something temporal
- involved in activities, spends less time at home
- transition from the parental home as “real” home

2. SSB, 2011, Levekår blant studenter 2010
3. Studiebyen/Sit, Boldeer2010
**And how do students live?**

Students’ housing situation must be seen as directly connected to their stage in life as characterized on the following page.

What makes students housing situation something unique is not only the groups in general limited financial resources, but more importantly the home as an arena for defining one self. As forming social relationships is crucial to this process students collectives obviously carry a lot of potential especially people in this phase.

Even though architects often strive for wide diversity of people to inhabit their projects, students, like other people, often seek together with other people in which they have something in common, being an interest, cause, activity, or stage in life. For institutionally proved housing it is therefore of main interest finding a reasonable side of the collectives, large enough for the residents to find both otherness end like minded, still small enough to contain a sense of community where each individual is seen.

2. SSB, 2011, Levekår blant studenter 2010
3. Studiebyen/Sit, Boldeer 2010
STUDENT MOVEMENT PATTERNS

The illustration shows a the typical moving stages of a student during the years in Trondheim. This is a highly simplified and generalized view, still serving to illustrate a clear pattern.

When first arriving the student moves into an institutionally provided (SiT) collective with complete strangers. This is followed by a stage in a private collective together with friends before ending up in a small apartment with a partner.

Why does the student move in the first place?

Students state that the wish to live with friends is the main reason not to live in student housing. This fact does not only imply a desire, but does also reflect the social life of the previous dwelling to be unsatisfactory.
The built environment influences the degree of privacy and social interaction in residential settings. **Social aspects of student life and the need for contacts among the various inhabitants are probably more important in a student house than in other residential settings.** Especially in the case of young students, who are used to living with their family around, new social relations need to be established when they move into their own place. Housing satisfaction among the students was influenced by such qualities as contact with flatmates or neighbours, and also by sufficient possibility of privacy. **The importance of a balance of privacy and social contact can also be seen as a necessary balance of individuality and communal life. The private space plays a significant role for an individual’s identity building, and the student phase is a time when personal identity has to be developed independently from the parental home.** Having the possibility to be alone and to have a private space to personalise are important aspects in this context.

The spatial organisation of the circulation area, the interconnection of private and common areas, and the entrance situation are crucial for regulating the quantity and quality of social contact. [...] **A balance of privacy and social contact is a necessary balance of individuality and communal life.** Too much emphasis on privacy may turn in the negative direction of anonymity, **The design of boarder spaces, such as semi-private spaces, entrance areas, verandas, and zones between the most private rooms and public areas, are critical to our experiences of a home environment. These spaces allow residents to move between inside and outside, to observe and guard their territory, and to meet others. In institutionally provided student housing, often too little emphasis is put on the design of the zone between private and public.**
Privacy and social life
How to design future student housing?
The study has looked into architectural aspects that contributed to both positive and negative perceptions among student residents. The building exterior, the use of materials and colours, the spatial organisation of circulation area and entrance, the usability of common facilities and private rooms, and their interconnection, had impact on the students’ perceptions of the building and influenced, for instance, an individual or anonymous notion, or an institutional or home-like character (see findings chapter).

[...]
The following key points address implications for design [...]. They are formulated as indicators of what, according to the findings from this study, may contribute to attractive student housing, no matter what the given context and housing form is:

– Variety instead of uniformity, in relation to the design of dwelling types, the use of materials and the building’s exterior design

– Non-standard instead of predictive design, focusing on material use and exterior design

– Robust yet aesthetic solutions, in material use and detailing in order to tolerate frequent use

– Differentiation of spaces and provision of private, semi-private and public areas, through the interconnection of spaces, a gradient between public-private and the definition of meeting points and common spaces (“boarder spaces”)

– Small groups instead of large groups, in relation to the number of students sharing an entrance and common facilities to enhance a feeling of belonging

– Floor plan solutions that allow for individual adjustments, considering the shape of rooms and their usability for e.g. re-furnishing
One of the main feedbacks I got from the midterm crits was that I should be thinking more urban. Student is not something that just happens in the collective houses themselves, but in the relation between them. Outdoors, just like a city. I'm trying to think more urban, shaping a clear focal point and center for the student village and also thinking about how to integrate with the surrounding fabric. Not just a place of entering Moholt Student Village, but a place to stay there.
Shaping the urban connection point and a main urban space, selection of sketches.
Real city-like. Imposing street grid with blocks. Forget about landscape, it’s just so rural!

But seems I can’t keep my self from at least opening the building blocks to that beautiful green park.
I'm trying to make top extensions work with the vertical volume concept. The verticality is lost. They do not connect with each other. Three different things: existing, main new buildings, roof top boxes. Tutu frutti is not a natural flavour.
Urban development vs park/landscape. The most important is that you are clear about which way to go.

The 1:500 model is not doing the concept any justice. Buildings seem massive, like single volumes with flat roofs. Not really communicating the concept. Make the volumes as solids, between only the slabs.

Top extensions. Are not working well together with the concept. Leave them, maybe investigate possibilities of roof top terraces instead.

Stick with the concept - volumes with circulation between. Investigate what happens if the angles are tightened up. 1 to 200?

Some of the buildings are too long, act as barriers, break up.

Kindergarten. Yes, this has to be investigated further. Try to integrate in the master plan.

Family units. Separate from other collectives. Make areas in the master plan. Family collectives, how can family living be collective? Follow same concept, slightly different answer to a different need?
THINKING ABOUT THE FAMILY

How can family apartments be collective and relate to each other & the common?
Private - shared- common / 1 - 2 - 4?
FAMILY COLLECTIVES

ONLY FAMILY UNITS.

2 & 3 Bedroom.

Smaller, more intimate collectives - 4 families sharing kitchen + common space + living area + dining area + play area.

Every family has: separate bedrooms, bathrooms, living/ play area.

Connecting to existing? What do I gain? What do they gain?

outdoor space.
Existing buildings. The preliminary work asks to investigate Discussion about wether or not to connect to the existing. Already left roof top. What about sides? Is there any real gain? Do the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. Challenging making levels heights fit. The project becomes more clear if the existing are left alone?

Geometry. Has gotten more defined, more clear on both master plan and dwelling level. But which one is really better?

Dwellings: Rooms between volumes more easily usable. More clear lines of circulation (can also be applied. Do they have different qualities? Can choose to do both, central area more strong and clear geometry, outer areas more loosely defined,

Master plan: Midterm proposal had a lot of landscape qualities. Don’t loose these! Don’t let the center get too big, this is not the city. Small, concentrated center.

Plans of rooms.
 Mostly good, one single room very long and narrow.

Kindergarten. Don’t let the size asked for by SiT be absolute. Adjust to master plan. Idea to integrate more closely with housing good.
Taking one step back, hopefully in order to make new one forward. Structuring the system, finding the core. Basics. What if they’re smaller? Small standard collectives to be repeated throughout? Now, that’s Moholt!

*Single + couple collectives. 10 + 10 persons. Common with kitchen an living between private volumes. (1:400)*
New structures in master plan.
Too much sameness?
(1:2000)

Family collectives. 2 + 2 families.
Separate kitchen volumes, living between. (1:400)
Go on with straight angle shapes. Can be used in different ways relating to urban or landscape. Work on outdoor spaces

Kindergarten - northern location works well.

Fire escape. If one fire cell in common area I need outside emergency staircases.

Energy use / glass. Calculate glass as percent of floor area. Should not be much bigger than 20%
  Checked: approx 15%

Master plan. Demolishment of existing houses. Not a clear question. Have to consider gain vs loss. Be clear.
  Update: goes for emailed idea.

Construction. Pre fabricated modules can be an idea, sizes depend on transportation sizes. Else walls as ready made elements.

Material. Consider cladding material. Not sure if horizontal wooden paneling is the right choice.
PHASE 3: CLOSING IN
Master plan

Continuously revising the master plan, and I think it’s starting to all fall into place nicely. Have to build a model of this and check out heights, gaps between buildings etc.

Main elements of master plan:
- Urban center
- Variety of outdoor spaces
- Using directions of existing buildings and landscape.

I truly believe this will better Moholt in a lot of aspects!

Zoom In
I will use the activity house building on the main center as my study area. Perhaps the most important one - what’s found out here will be applicable to a lot of others
Been doing a lot of thinking about collective sizes (once again). I’ve decided to go for a quite big size, as I think I’ve found a type/structure that could work very well in collective aspects. The collectives, and common areas are large in square meters, but manageable and understandable with several smaller zones where students can do a whole lot of different activities. Flexible spaces to suit different situations.

Collectives (the whole building) has kitchens on main floor, between the common zones and the public student village. Kitchens are placed in same volumes - ok programmed space vs open flexible space
TO DEMO OR NOT TO DEMO?

So far I’ve pretty much stuck with the rule of not to demolish any of the existing student housing. The argumentation being they’re a valuable recourse and that there should be plenty of space left at Moholt to achieve what I want anyway. Working with a new center I’m starting to consider this decision, simply because I realize better outdoor spaces as well as a higher total number of units will be possible by demolishing a few houses. It is also worth noting that I already long ago decided to tear down the existing grocery, activity house, kindergartens and a few other standard houses, so really it hasn’t been a consistent rule not to touch them at all. E-mailed my considerations to Svein, who follows the arguments and agree.
Latest master plan proposal as model. Found out some quite useful things:
- Buildings do not necessarily have to be of uniform height: Lowering volumes towards the end makes the connection to lower neighboring volumes smoother and makes room for a roof terrace.
- The master plan is not consistent in how buildings relate to the existing houses. I’ve managed to define outdoor spaces with most, but not all new buildings.
- Some of the private room volumes bet too high - should counter this with a base.
The main facade composition of vertical volumes have been a part of the concept for long, but now I find myself working a lot with various elements of the facade. I want a dialogue with existing houses. Something that works well together, picks up points, but does not copy. Generally there is a lot of repetition for the program of most floors, and I wish to find a way to express individuality within a greater sense or system of order. I think I will spend quite some time on figuring this one out, but things seem to be heading the right way.
LAST WEEKS / LAST WORDS

The last weeks of the project have obviously been filled with hard work, finalizing the last aspects, producing drawings, models, and presentation material. These efforts can be seen in the final material.

The thesis project has been a long road, and though most of the time felt I had a sense of which direction I was heading, I could never have imagined what was to be discovered along the way and where I would be at the end of the project.

Sverre Bjerkholt Aamlid
Architect to be.