Cloud Studio 2017-2018  MONIKA THADHANI and CHRISTOPHER CROESBECK Studio – 6 credits

The Spaces in Between

PRACTICE BASED COURSE WITH COLLABORATION WITH REAL ESTATE DEVELOPERS, ARCHITECTS, DESIGNERS, ENGINEERS, AND CITY PLANNERS

STUDIO OBJECTIVES: Develop new concepts of “community” that address the continual evolution of social changes resulting from unpredictable economies, changing technologies, political ideologies and climate issues. The course will test an approach of a metropolis as a network of “thresholds”, the spaces in between that address the ambiguities of public and private space in a world that has created digital social interaction as a substitute for the lack of renewed public infrastructure that support the notion and concepts of “community” and “home” in our present day of metropolitan environment.

The proposed site is known as “The Gateway”, a 27-acre property that would connect the South loop to Burnham Park and the larger regional developments at McCormick Place. The studio will be a mixed use development program focused on residential destination with social and cultural activities in collaboration with the developer, Hammes Corporation, the property owner Fogelson Properties and the City of Chicago. The Studio would learn to collaborate on large scale planning with supporting disciplines to develop critical thinking and innovative approaches to future of the cities. In addition, the studio will study the historical role of development within air-rights over the existing transportation infrastructure at “The Gateway” site. Historically this has played a significant role in the planning of Chicago and reclaiming the divisive effects of necessary infrastructure into connections between communities and most notably the Chicago lakefront.

STUDIO TOPIC: Studio will explore the future of the community with the changing demographics and expectations of a generation fully enfranchised in an environment of social interface through the development of technology that has created an ambiguity of public versus private life, through a cultural acceptance of the risk of information pertaining to oneself, exposed on a scale unprecedented in human history. This risk has created a condition of “sharing” of actions and experiences once considered “private” into a more public realm that has both the opportunity and risk of exposure beyond the original convention. This condition has been universally embraced to the stage of our political discourse at the highest levels of government that carries the potential consequences of an overnight change in the perception of a country and its values. The poet T. S. Eliot whose work explores the subconscious relationships between private life and social interactions describes the concept of “threshold” in his seminal poem “The Love song of J. Alfred Prufrock” where one crossing this threshold puts on “a face to meet the faces you meet”. The threshold both physical and symbolic has now changed to our subconscious decisions to withhold or to share. Eliot poem is a dramatic interior monologue of an urban
man, troubled with feelings of isolation and his inability for decisive action that represents frustration and impotence of modern individual. Studio will examine the physical absolute space as an expression of the inner desire for social interaction at a larger scale than that currently afforded by our metropolitan environments dominated by the separations imposed by limitless expansion, lack of the social infrastructure and spaces that serve this purpose. It will study the condition of “homelessness”, not without a dwelling but rather family or emotional connections to the community imposed by a transitory condition of changes through movement of place for economic, educational, political and cultural reasons. In the digital era the “experience” becomes a substitute for “home”. The question of the condition of “home” versus “homelessness” in its physical and symbolic aspect may be studied through a phenomenological approach, departing from previously held notions and assumptions to an understanding of the transcendent nature of immediate “experience” as a substitute for the identification of “home” in a “homelessness” condition. This experience and identification of “home” is a larger program of possibilities that extend beyond the minimum requirements that serve the daily physical needs provided by the tradition concept of “dwelling” whether is a house or a leased apartment unit and it is directly related to the notion and concept of “community”. The meanings of community, home, homelessness, house, family, dwelling unit, private and public space will be examined in the present and future conditions of the metropolis.

An approach that looks not only at the dwelling unit itself, which can have multiple manifestations from a precisely designed unit and the space that connects these units and a re-evaluation of the concept of “threshold” and its physical manifestations represented in ancient Greece as “Khora”. These concepts have been studied by philosophers such as Plato, Heidegger and Derrida as well as architects such as Peter Eisenman and Rikan Yamamoto as a third kind of space, an interval a filter between the private and public that as Derrida has stated “waver between the logic of exclusion and that of participation”. The studio will study this ancient and re-interpreted concept of Khora as it evolves into the essential “system” or “layer” that negotiates private and public space that in its totality reimages the idea of home and community.

This concept of the space in between, the threshold is not new and as the platform is Chicago to this specific region itself. Older communities that were developed through the significant immigration and settlement of this region between the 1820’s up to the 1860’s and beyond built traditional walkable communities of which the entrance to the home was through the porch, the exterior space of ownership that connected the dwelling to the larger public and social possibilities available in the ritual as participating in a community. This was an adaptation and reinterpretation to the transitional spaces between home and the community seen in the courtyards, balconies and terraces of European cities that directly connected to a larger system of public space not dominated by cars but rather social interchange. The hermetic nature of high rise building and density has traditionally created a separation excludes the dwelling from the idea of social interchange and creates the foundation of the “homelessness” condition the Metropolis. The studio will take an inverted approach and look at this connection as the driver for the future metropolis. An
approach of a metropolis as a network of “micro-villages” where the residents live, work, recreate and develop institutions suitable for their communities connected at all levels by a shared understanding of public space and threshold may be a future that in many respects recalls a “memory” of the past but in different forms and densities, technologies and programs. Within this frame-work the studio must also respond to how this investigation can be aligned by the realities of a world that is focused on financing and return on investment (ROI). Traditional approaches are driven by market studies that are used to obtain the investment necessary from Financial Institutions to minimize “risk” and develop sufficient revenue to incentivize the risk takers. It is important that the design and development community establishes a common language that connects usefulness and necessity, providing models which address the latent needs of changing community that is sustainable on an economic, social and environmental platform. Real Estate entities have been grounded in the interest of “transaction” should be provided with a model of “transformation” that offers an inevitable argument to help create a future metropolis with better alignment of social outcome. To accomplish this both architect and developer must find a common language that serves as the foundation to develop intelligent outcomes.

Travel:
Studio will have option to travel overseas in location to be determined to visit similar scale developments that have direct relation to Studio Topic.

Bibliography:

- “On Growth and Form” by D’ Arcy Thompson
- “Anatomy of Reality” by Jonas Salk
- “Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge” by E.O. Wilson
- “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” by Thomas Kuhn
- “The Idea of the Town” by Joseph Rykwert
- “Space Time and Architecture” by Siegfried Gideon
- “Culture: City – Edited by Wilfried Lang
- “Planning in Chicago” – D. Bradford Hunt and Jon B. Devries
- “Tower and Office – From Modernist Theory to Contemporary Practice” – Inaki Abalos & Juan Herreros
- “Townscape” Gordon Cullen
- “An Essay on Man” - Ernst Cassirer
- “American Building” – Carl W. Condit
Invited Speakers and Third Party Collaborators:

- Buro - Happold – One of leading global engineering and planning firms will consult on all issues of planning and design as well as Urban Infrastructure, Resilience, Public policy, Transportation, Environmental as Energy and Low Carbon strategies.
- Jon DeVries – Director of the Marshal Bennett School of Real Estate, Roosevelt University and author of recently published book “Planning Chicago” will shed light on the efforts of planning in Chicago for the last 50 years.
- Tom Voltaggio and Craig Burton of Interface Engineering one of the leading sustainable infrastructure practices in Chicago
- The Hammes Company – Developer of the Gateway site  
- Fogelson Properties -Current landowner and co-developer of Museum Park South.  
- Forest City Enterprises - Co-Developer of Museum Park South.  
- Lori Healy -Chairman of the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority.  
- Robert McKenna of the City of Chicago Department of Planning and Development.

Knowledge and Expertise:

- Focus on structure and history of urban planning with concurrent development of architectural responses to principles developed for macro scale development.
- Understand the interdisciplinary interplay between planning, landscape and architecture.
- Develop new ecological prototypes of urban architecture that will partner with natural systems to shape, redefine the future city and to address global sociological, economic and ecological issues.
- Understand the relationship of the academic world and the global professional world and their interconnection in developing responsible and ecological approaches for the future of our cities.

Attendance

Attendance is mandatory. Conflicts due to Academic Reasons will be handled on a student by student basis. More than three (3) absences not previous agreed upon by Professors will cause failure of class.
Schedule or time line of the semester studio program activities – Fall, 2017

Week 1 – Studio Introduction. Review of Fall Semester Activities - Research of program, site and course objectives. Exercise of analysis and description of places that have inspired students thinking.

Week 2 – Continue research and develop program and planning alternate concept (3) three for Gateway Site for studio review. Teams will then be assigned based on alignment of concepts and analysis. Studio will watch film to be announced. Studio builds Master Site model.

Week 3 – Teams will continue and synthesize research and planning concepts and prepare for guest critic week 4 presentation. Required material will be program statement and program, research, concept statement, site plan, site sections, general area floor plans and 3D physical model. The presentations will be required to include diagrams showing area, circulation, environment, land use, public transportation, open space and ecological strategies.

Week 4 – Guest critic third party collaborators review. Teams will modify and develop schemes based on comments and recommendations reviewers. Studio Lecture “Planning in Chicago”.

Week 5 – Preparation for mid -term reviews. Material for presentation is updated version of week 3 requirements.

Week 6 – Mid -term Presentations. Review of presentations.

Week 7 – Studio travel-optimal to a comparative city.

Week 8 – Continue development of planning and architectural approach with focus on detail planning and incorporation of course principles. In house studio reviews.

Week 9 – Guest Lecture, approach with pin up and reviews from 3rd Party collaborators

Week 10 - Finalize planning and architectural approach incorporating comments from third party collaborators.

Week 11 – Fall break

Week 12, 13 - Prepare for final review to include research, analysis planning, architectural plans, sections, elevations, concept statement, 3D Models physical and digital. Ecological analysis.

Week 14 – Final Reviews and studio report compilation.

Evaluation Criteria

Only letter grades will be given and these will be based on a curve.

Grades will be issued for each project and these will be based on the following criteria:

1. Conceptual sophistication and critical thinking
2. Sophistication and extent of project investigation and development
3. Sophistication and quality of presentation material (drawings and models)
4. Participation in class and critiques

A final letter grade will be compiled from all assignments.

The School policy on grading is attached here:

A Excellent work that is on time and complete
B Above average work that is on time and complete
C Average work that is on time and complete
D Below average work, late work, or incomplete work
F Unacceptable work

Please refer to Graduate Bulletin for official IIT university grading policies

It is expected that all students will put considerable time, thought, and effort into their work. However, those factors do not of themselves guarantee any particular grade. On time and complete work is needed for a grade of A, B, or C, but timeliness and completeness alone do not constitute or guarantee a passing grade. When the work is on time and complete, quality in both thought and production are the primary considerations for the grade:

**Excellent work** – Demonstrates an ability to identify and develop a unique line of inquiry derived from, yet extending, the basic proposition of the assignment or course. Exceeds the expectations of the faculty and the assignment in the quality of thought and production.

**Above average work** – Excels in understanding and development of work relative to assignment scope. Demonstrates an ability to assess feedback and respond thoughtfully in the further development of the assignment.

**Average work** – Meets the basic expectations and requirements in terms of assignment scope as outlined in assignments or stated by the instructor.

**Below average work** – Does not meet all of the basic expectations and requirements. Does not consistently demonstrate a basic understanding of primary course objectives and concerns and/or an ability to respond to feedback and guidance by the instructor. Is inconsistent in its production and development, and is frequently late and/or incomplete.

**Unacceptable work** – Does not meet the majority of basic expectations and requirements. Seldom demonstrates a basic understanding of primary course objectives and concerns and/or an ability to respond to feedback and guidance by the instructor. Is inconsistent in its production and development, and is consistently late and/or incomplete.

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Policy:**
Reasonable accommodations will be made for students with documented disabilities. In order to receive accommodations, students must go through the Center for Disability Resources office. The Center for Disability Resources (CDR) is located in Life Sciences Room 218, telephone 312.567.5744 or disabilities@iit.edu.