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Abstract

This thesis was born through and exploration of the Architectural realms modus operandi in terms of the exclusionary nature that seems to permeate throughout the industry. The question of who can make and experience Architecture brings to centre stage an imbalance. Political, economic and social barriers all stand in the way of Architecture being a more democratic form. It is an ironic duality that lies here as Architecture is simultaneously one of the most public and private forms of art one can make. Public in its symbolic and monumental nature, while private in its inherent need to protect and shelter. It is an unfortunate truth, but very few people are fortunate enough to experience Architecture.

However, even within its exclusive nature, Architecture, at times finds itself doing the opposite. Moments of sharing and collaboration within schools, institutions and the fields showcase an ability for Architecture to be by and for more people. The Open City created by the Valparaiso school of Architecture,1 and the enigmatic and visual magazines by Archigram brushed on a more inclusive Architecture.2 That being said, even within these instances, it is still limiting, as only those who may be fortunate enough to attend the schools or be directly connected to the social circles of the individuals involved may benefit from it.

What is needed then is an Architecture that openly calls for collaboration from a wider range of fields without a bias of class, schools or connection. Be it artists, scientist or engineers; through the joint efforts of a group containing a wider skillset, the sharing and learning through collaboration will help Architecture broaden its sense of collaboration.

The vehicle that is then proposed as the Architectural answer to this is The Box, a cross disciplinary creative residency that will operate in a nomadic nature. The Box will create an open invitation for creatives of all fields to come together on the completion of an art installation, allowing for a wide range of projects to possibly appear. However, as a means of mitigating the exclusion that may come with a project like The Box, it will use the world’s existing networks of highways, railroads, and shipping routes to affect as many people as it can. Paired with its quarter-annual schedule, the project will aim to effect as wide an audience as possible.

The question then that my thesis asks is, can we use Architecture to create an Architecture that facilitates cross disciplinary collaboration and learning to a wider audience than already exists?

Key Words: Collaboration, World Travel, Elitism, Exclusion
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Introduction
Exclusion in Architecture

Within the architectural community in the west, there is an inherent sense of exclusion. Formed through a myriad of social and economic issues, this aura pervades Architecture and limits who can experience and create it. To be clear, in regards to Architecture, I do not mean mere architectural buildings. If that was the case, then it can be argued that almost all people in the west experience Architecture on a daily basis. One can not go about their day without entering something within the built environment, be it their home, school, subway station or other. What I mean by in regards to Architecture (with a capital ‘A’) are parts of the built environment with a design focus in mind. Not purely pragmatic in their function or copy and pasted “cookie cutter homes”, but thoughtful and beneficial elements of the built environment. If Architecture can have positive affects on people and the world, should not everyone be able to benefit from it?

This leads to the question of who can benefit and experience Architecture. Why is it that Architecture is experienced by so few, even though a large portion of human time is spent in built structures? One of the answers to this can be found within an economic realm. Architecture is an expensive profession, as building a structure that is artistically expressive, functional, and safe is by no means an easy task and sometimes the most expensive solution to a design problem.

Statistically speaking as well, Architects in Canada that earn a degree from a graduate program can find themselves earning a salary of $35,000-$65,000 dollars, putting them within the top 10% of the population earnings within their age group in 2016. It can be concluded than that if one wishes to have a piece of Architecture created on their behalf, they must be able to afford the work of an Architect, or gather together with others to do so. This disparaging fact then leads to a decline in the amount of Architecture in the world, and even if by some happenstance one was intrigued enough by the idea of creating a piece of Architecture, they would most likely not be able to afford it. This leads one to the option of creating Architecture themselves, and to do this they would need to enroll in an Architecture school which also presents issues.

Within the realm of academia in Canada, Architecture is by no means a cheap degree to get. Schools typically only accept close to 100 students a year, and on average an Architectural undergraduate degree is the 9th most expensive degree one could get. This does not include the monetary value of surprise charges, as students in almost all schools find themselves spending an exuberant amount on building material/supplies, computers, programs, printing, text books and travel based design studios. In many cases students even find themselves leaning on parental support to help with these exorbitant fees, even after governmental assistance, begging the question of what do those incapable of receiving this support gain. It is this narrow gate within the realm of academia that keeps many people away from becoming architects, some even changing career paths mid way through a program. This is not to say that it is impossible to get an Architectural degree, but that there is a barrier in getting one felt more by some than others.

These two prior economical issues also feed into the level of interest of Architecture. As the exclusionary nature of the profession is in part created by the economical factors mentioned, those who can experience reflects that nature. A by product of this is also the awareness of the benefits of Architecture. For many who have not experienced it, the desire or apparent benefits of well designed pieces of Architecture is lost on them. Since they have been denied the opportunity to naturally develop a sense of understanding for good Architecture, they may not make the most beneficial decision when they may one day need to make a decision related to an Architectural problem.

Physically as well, Architecture now more than ever keeps people out. Walls, fences, and tolls make even the most transparent of glass towers limiting to those who may wish to enter it. What was once more a focus on excluding the harsh elements of the world has shifted to a focus on presenting only the best for those who can obtain the needed educational credits. This leads to a decline in the amount of Architecture in the world, and even if by some happenstance one was intrigued enough by the idea of creating a piece of Architecture, they would most likely not be able to afford it. This leads one to the option of creating Architecture themselves, and to do this they would need to enroll in an Architecture school which also presents issues.
of keeping people out.

Evidently, as school fees continue to rise, buildings continue to exclude and the cycle continuously feeds into its own exclusionary nature, the question of how more can experience and create Architecture becomes increasingly more pressing. Non of this is to undermine or imply that architecture is by any means an easy profession. The needs for knowledge, skill, critical thought and creativity are still incredibly necessary in creating Architecture. However, this is to say that Architecture is not an inclusive profession, creating this sense of exclusion within itself. As fewer people become inspired and aware of its benefits, fewer people become interested in pursuing it, fewer people create Architecture, and ultimately fewer people experience it.

With all that being said, it is clear that this issue is deeply rooted and can not be simply fixed. Are imagining of the values of Architecture may be possible if we look at how those within Architecture position themselves to those not within it. A greater sense of sympathy may help aid in the broadening of the way those within the Architectural realm see those not within it, and a starting point to this may be in the creation of Architecture. What follows is a look into how architects collaborate with other fields outside of architecture, and the possible benefits of broadening that collaboration.

Figure 1: Proposed Cyclical Relations of Architecture Exclusion

Notes
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Architecture is not the only field that has suffered from the constraints of exclusion. Many other artistic fields have in some way or another been plagued by an issue of exclusion in the past. Music, for example, was once something that people only made for themselves with the few instruments at their disposal, but now can be easily recorded, bought, stored and distributed. Paintings, film, and literature have all gone through a similar process. What made their democratization possible was that advancements in technology simplified the means of production. Within the age of mechanical reproduction, art forms that would by no means be reproducible for a mass audience are now capable of doing just that. In a sense, broadening the work as not only being created by the artist, but a wider collaborative effort. No longer are paintings held exclusively for those that can afford an original but all can enhance their homes. This is not to say that these reproductions are by any means as good as the originals, as they lack an aura of authenticity; but it is to say that more people can experience its beauty, even if it is a reduced one.

With all that in mind however, we must not be bogged down to think that the act of mass production is the simple solution to the problems of exclusion. Mass production does bring with it an assortment of issues and problems. When done improperly, huge effects may appear within the social, economical and environmental regions related to the mass production. What does lie at the core of the democratization of these art forms is in fact the simplification of the process of making them, as well as how many hands go into making them. Not just their duplication but the entirety of the process. From conception, to production, to reproduction and then finally distribution. The modern age has made it possible for works to be created far faster than they have been, and shared far wider through mailing and the internet.

Why then does Architecture still suffer from this exclusion? Is it that is has yet to garner benefits from the technologies of the time? A quick glimpse at the industry proves this to be false. Modern technology is in fact at the forefront of Architecture’s evolution in the modern age. BIM technology allows for the incredibly intricate act of Architecture to be more efficiently streamlined then ever before. The fact of the matter, as mentioned previously, is that the creation of Architecture is an incredibly complex and difficult task. However, even in its complexity and relation to exclusion, portions of the field have shown incredible progress in addressing this through an effective use of collaboration. So, what exactly is it that results in the collaborative nature of Architecture still producing an exclusionary Architectural Ecosystem?

Collaboration, by its very nature, defies exclusion, being its complete opposite in that it asks for people to come together and share, rather than keep people away. Schools tend to do this well at times, knowing that collaboration not only allows for more feasible large scale projects being completed on a timeline, but as well, helps individuals learn a broader range of knowledge they may never have stumbled across. Not only limited to location, some schools have gone as far as collaborating with distant schools across the world on projects within a digital design studios such as the Virtual Design Studio on the cloud that was a collaboration between students from Bilkent University in Turkey and East Carolina University in the USA. The students from these projects all confirmed that they did in fact learn lessons they considered valuable and enjoyed the project. It is clear that at a macro scale, what collaboration in schools sometimes achieves is a distribution of authorship, changing what would be an Architecture made by the few to an Architecture made by the many and ultimately making it more inclusive.
For a slightly broader pool of collaboration, one may look at the work of the MIT Media Lab and the team currently led by Neri Oxman. It consists of skilled students from MIT. The MIT Media lab assembles a diverse group of people from technology, media, science, art and design backgrounds to collaborate on a single project.1 Within their varied backgrounds, the teams consist of two people of the same background with each pairing coming from different realms.8 For example their may be two Architecture student as well as a pair of biochemical students to name a few. It is through their varied backgrounds that they are able to execute their projects so spectacularly, with the inspiration and execution being so drastically different from project to project.7

Lastly, within the actual architectural industry, collaboration is apparent all over. With the complexities and hardships in making an architectural building, a myriad of profession are called to action. That being said, each project does hold these collaborators to different standards. Within some projects, artists and architects work hand in hand in the creation of a piece of Architecture,9 while other projects only bring in collaborators at a very superficial level of consultation.

It is apparent then that collaboration is possible within the realm of Architecture, however the exclusionary nature of the industry is still present. If collaboration is thus the impetus for a greater level of inclusion, perhaps what is necessary is not more collaboration but a reimagining of how collaboration in Architecture may operate.

Not just limited to those who may be able to afford schooling or those who may be contracted for a feasible version of collaboration, but to the many. What is needed is an Architecture that itself facilitates sharing and collaboration with a wider audience in the hopes of mutual benefits of cross disciplinary learning. An Architecture that will allow Architecture to learn how to collaborate more broadly.
Theoretical Framework
Open City

When discussing works of Architecture that step away from the norm in order to encourage collaboration and challenge the modes of thinking in the profession, one can not avoid looking at the Institute for Architecture of the Catholic University of Valparaiso and the Open City. Fuelled by passion in their approach, architect Alberto Cruz and poet Godofredo Iommi spearheaded the new school of Architecture that would hold the poetic word to a level of importance equitable with the built environment.1 Beginning in 1952, the school began an evolutionary process of creating a pedagogy that would step away from the professional side of Architecture in preference to the poetics needed to create Architecture that was more than just shells of occupancy.2

Although beginning in 1952, Cruz and Iommi met for the first time in 1950.3 Both men having been influenced greatly by the world around them, Cruz in his travels to Europe and Iommi in his adoration of modern French poetry, discussed ideas surrounding architecture, poetry and creating a great shift.4 They believed that Architecture was plagued by the doctrine it was in, and that by moving away from it and towards a poetic methodology that it would possibly be saved.5 For them, the system of the profession was entirely unbeneﬁcial because of the compromises that came along with it.6 Shortly after meeting each other, the opportunity to lead the development of the Institute for Architecture of the Catholic University of Valparaiso came about, and from the start collaboration was integral to it.

Cruz firmly believed that one or two strong professors would not be enough, but that a working group would be drastically more beneﬁcial.7 The founding group of professors for the new school were then Alberto Cruz (architect), Godofredo Iommi (poet), Francisco Mendez (painter), Arturo Baeza (architect), Jaime Bellalta (architect), Fabio Cruz (architect), Miguel Eyquem (architect), José Vial (architect), and shortly afterwards Claudio Girola (sculptor).8 The founders and their families all lived together, splitting their salaries amongst each other and redistributing them according to the need of families.9 Cruz was so adamant about the collective dimension that a condition was set by which any faculty invitation to speak was only accepted if addressed to the entire group.10 Within this collective nature, there was thus another level of abdication from the norms of the profession, as no one or few individuals held prowess, but the group did mutually, in a sense sterilizing the growth of an elitist mentality.

The modern French poetry that the faculty believed in was thus an integral part of the pedagogy. However, other inﬂuences where also present in their work. The faculty aimed for a fusion between life and art. They believed that true art of any form with transcend its own self, presenting beyond its materiality to what is invisible within itself.11 Influenced by some degree by Le Corbusier, the pedagogy focused not on the plastic promises of technology in Corbusier’s work, but the idea of an Architecture of creativity.12 Merging the Poetic and the Plastic, the soulful impact of words would then be manifested in the built environment. It was then pertinent that this fusion of life and art be present in the pedagogy of the school.

The school was at the beginning within Viña del Mar, Chile and at the time did not have any standardized studio spaces.13 This resulted in a student network becoming intertwined with the city and the urban fabric acting as a laboratory.14 One of the assignation of the school in sustaining the laboratory type environment was handing students a photo of a place within the city. Students were tasked to not only find that location during the term but document their search for it.15 Although some students would not find the location, what was integral was the journey in discovering the city.

Another very crucial aspect of how art and life merged within the school was Phalène, or the poetic act. These acts that brought together poetry, place and space where originally developed from seminars that were held by Iommi on modern poetry and art.16 Acting as a public performance of sort, the Phalène slowly evolved from being mere presentation of poetry to becoming a collaborative effort through and through, on the form of creating poetry, or the playing of a game as a group.17 By concentrating the creative thoughts of a collective of people, be it architect, poet, or engineer, the Phalène sought to create something greater than what could be possible on ones own, and it was through this that Godofredo was able to write Amerida, outlining the intentions and approach of the school.18
Although the school had been operating since 1952, the Open City did not begin until 1970. As the pedagogy of the school evolved, so too did the work produced by it. The Phalène which was once static in its location, evolved into the Travesias, which were expeditions to selected remote areas to build structures. The poetic acts followed the guideline of the Amereida in materializing the poetic into a built part of the environment. After eighteen years of experimentation, thought, and the intentions of a poetic Architecture, the Phalène influenced the Amereida and the Travesias, to ultimately culminate into the Open City. Not regimented by the modern grid or regional zoning but poetic influence. Collaboration, functionality, and need all came together within the poetic acts that would then be the groundwork for the buildings.

The Open City was only one in a metaphorical sense, located in a rural area some 30km north of Valparaiso and near the sea. It can be seen as the most developed and successful showcasing of the school's pedagogy. It operated with an autonomous matter that allowed the people to regulate it within their own accord. The city included workshops, housing, open-air chapel, halls, and even a cemetery along with less habitable installations and art pieces. It was by the creation of the city through operating within the scarce materials at their disposal, budget restrictions, and as a non-profit whose assets were non-transferable that the Open City truly showcased how Architecture of poetry could be egalitarian.

There are many lessons to be understood from the Institute for Architecture of the Catholic University of Valparaiso and the Open City in terms of addressing the exclusion found in Architecture. What is made evidently clear is the ability of collaboration to dismantle the effects of ownership and control that make Architecture exclusive. Although somewhat a theoretical base as the school, for the most part, acted as its own client; the Open City showcases a great example of tackling the question of who can make Architecture.

What is also seen, pivotal in Cruz and Iommi’s success, is the understanding of the significance of other art forms. Similar in some ways to the case studies within *Art and Architecture: A Place Between*, by balancing the two worlds, Architecture may be able to step away from the patriarchal lead it is so accustomed to. The Open City does not mistake art for Architecture, or Architecture for Art. It plays with the inherent differences in Architectures need for function as opposed to arts sole relationship to expression. Built projects such as the studio spaces within the Open City express a poetic nature in their relation to the site and material, but a practical understanding of the requirements of building more projects.

One could argue that what the Open City accomplished over time can be closely related to the concept of the Architecture of the Everyday by Deborah Berke. Berke argued that the commercialization of the modern world and its adoration of fame had led to a stale Architecture. Architects had to become branded and recognized in order to receive the opportunity to build, and in doing so led to the rise of signature style buildings and increased sense of ownership from architects. The Architecture of the everyday was Berke’s response to this crisis, in that it is not everyday buildings, but the consciousness of Architecture being put into every building, similar to the Open City. Every building was a conscious act to effect the site and the landscape, informed by poetry, made by the community, and then acted on by the community.

Within Cruz and Iommi’s approach to a creation of a great shift in Architecture through poetry, they addressed some issues of elitism in Architecture. They believed that for Architecture and poetry to merge, a collective of people was needed to work together, and in doing so this collaboration tackled the question of who Architecture could be made by. By using a collective knowledge, an artisanal and light building style, and an explorative process to create Architecture; the archetypal image of the lone Architect was displaced by a more democratic image of Architecture made by people.
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Another crucial grouping of motivated ideas in Architecture is that of the Archigram group, who operated in multiple mediums but are primarily known for the self-published magazines they collaborated on. Although works in the magazines always had a wide range of authors contributing to it, the core members of the group were Peter Cook, David Greene, Warren Chalk, Dennis Crompton, Ron Herron and Michael Webb. The making of their magazines was an inherently collaborative process that took place throughout the years of 1961-1970, as the group successfully distributed the magazines on a close to annual basis. By the time the final issue had been created, the work of the group was already being picked up by other architectural journals and magazines. It was clear to see that the work of the group did indeed have an effect on the architectural world, but how did it come to this?

Starting with the 1st Archigram issue in 1961 that only had a mere 400 copies made of the 2 page issue, the group slowly began to garner both attention and respect. Although the response to the work at the time was no where near what it would find itself being in later years, the slow circulation within their networks of colleagues and schools would grow into something greater.

By the 2nd issue, all of the members that would be known as the Archigram group were actively contributing to the magazine with Cook as the editor, Greene as an associate and the rest listed as contributors. Released in May 1962, the 7 page issue focused more on connecting the ideas of the projects found within it then the first issue did.

The 4th issue, known as the zoom issue, was arguably one of the most well-known copies, taking from the culture of comics and looking at the fictional cities created within so many of them. The 1964 issue included 16 double sided pages and a pop-up centerfold.
The 5th issue contained 22 pages and was released in autumn 1964. This issue focused on the narratives that the Archigram had already been discussing but with a greater focus on the metropolis and cities. Presenting schemes that were on a larger scale than Archigram usually tackled, it was clear to see a growth present in their work while maintaining the same critical inquiry into the practice.

The 6th Archigram issue was released in 1965 and became their most iconic with a green and red curved paper contained in a plastic bag, it asked readers to send their organizations and thoughts back to them. The issue also contained 2 cut out pages that would fold into geometries, allowing the reader to also create what could be argued as Architecture to join in on the discourse.

The 7th issue began the experimental process within Archigram as they began to incorporate their growing influence and audience within their work. Containing seventeen various sized loose sheets paper contained in a plastic bag, it asked readers to create an apparent organization of the projects and ideas presented. Inviting the people to not only be an audience of discourse but to participate in it by sending their organizations and thoughts back to them. The issue also contained 2 cut out pages that would fold into geometries, allowing the reader to also create what could be argued as Architecture to join in on the discourse.

The 8th issue was their second to be heavily closed as well. The issue also contained work from people outside of the Architectural realm. The issue was meant to inform their audience of their ongoing projects as the magazine by Reyner Banham, Peter Cook was inspired by the idea of rounding up not only the works and ideas of colleagues, but his own as well. Already a part of a larger group of young individuals meeting loosely to discuss the issues around the world of architecture, the three members, Peter Cook, David Greene and Michael Webb broke off from the group in order to pursue paper as an agent of change. As both Cook and Greene were working in the same office at the time, the two used those resources to help jump start the magazine. In analyzing the first issue, a mere two pieces of paper stapled together, there is no apparent constitution of an end goal, but instead an ongoing dispute in what it was doing. The issue collaged and pulled together an assortment of projects, as a showcasing of what "the new Generation of Architecture" saw in the world. Even within their future issues, it was clear that Archigram was fueled by a desire to intervene on what Architecture was and where it was headed. What then became their annual focus was what best showcased the possibility of these interventions.

The creators of Archigram had a strong sense of belief in their idea of the future being developed by new ideas of the youth. It was in their belief of this that the collages found in their projects so often included competition entries and their own work from their time as students. Even within the first issue, as if a visual representation of their hostility to the Architecture of their time, the issues collages were loud and busy. Not only the gaps within the collage but also the gaps within the typeset font were bombarded with hand written text. This denial of a conformation to a set structure for their medium, from size to layout, was indicative of denial of the status quo and its ability to lead Architecture in a constructive dimension. Their short introduction at the beginning of most of the issues allowed for the reader to grasp, ever so slightly, the ideas which they wished to explore; while the projects within them only served to further this connection from the reader to the idea.

Many of the Archigram projects in particular showcase an understanding of not only the people they propose to build for, but the complex network elements of any architectural project in a city. One in particular that shows relevance to the concept of an architecture that empowers the people while maintaining a nomadic nature is the Instant City project. It was proposed as a project to empower smaller metropolitan areas by bringing the complex at its core, the Archigram group was formed by an unerring feeling of discontent felt towards the architectural industry and where Architecture was heading. After reading a description of Frühlicht magazine by Reyner Banham, Peter Cook was inspired by the idea of rounding up not only the works and ideas of colleagues, but his own as well. Already a part of a larger group of young individuals meeting loosely to discuss the issues around the world of architecture, the three members, Peter Cook, David Greene and Michael Webb broke off from the group in order to pursue paper as an agent of change. As both Cook and Greene were working in the same office at the time, the two used those resources to help jump start the magazine. In analyzing the first issue, a mere two pieces of paper stapled together, there is no apparent constitution of an end goal, but instead an ongoing dispute in what it was doing. The issue collaged and pulled together an assortment of projects, as a showcasing of what "the new Generation of Architecture" saw in the world. Even within their future issues, it was clear that Archigram was fueled by a desire to intervene on what Architecture was and where it was headed. What then became their annual focus was what best showcased the possibility of these interventions.

The creators of Archigram had a strong sense of belief in their idea of the future being developed by new ideas of the youth. It was in their belief of this that the collages found in their projects so often included competition entries and their own work from their time as students. Even within the first issue, as if a visual representation of their hostility to the Architecture of their time, the issues collages were loud and busy. Not only the gaps within the collage but also the gaps within the typeset font were bombarded with hand written text. This denial of a conformation to a set structure for their medium, from size to layout, was indicative of denial of the status quo and its ability to lead Architecture in a constructive dimension. Their short introduction at the beginning of most of the issues allowed for the reader to grasp, ever so slightly, the ideas which they wished to explore; while the projects within them only served to further this connection from the reader to the idea.

Many of the Archigram projects in particular showcase an understanding of not only the people they propose to build for, but the complex network elements of any architectural project in a city. One in particular that shows relevance to the concept of an architecture that empowers the people while maintaining a nomadic nature is the Instant City project. It was proposed as a project to empower smaller metropolitan areas by bringing the complex.
networks of agents that make metropolitan cities feel alive to these smaller ones. The parts of the City that would become the agents of change were transported with trucks and planes to the smaller metropolises. In the use of existing and temporary structure, the Instant City would, as its name implied, create an instant network within the city through the creation of event, displays and educational programs. After its stay, the City would depart for its next location but leave some of the spaces created behind to both invigorate the city and digitally connect it to the next location the Instant City was heading to.

What can then be garnered about the battle with Architectural exclusion and how architecture collaborates through the works of Archigram are a few things. As seen in the works of Valparaiso mentioned earlier, the primary agent of change necessary in any shift of ideologies is the people as well as collaboration. It is only through the continued discussion and deliberation of ideas, with peers and non-peers alike, that new outlooks and interventions, as well as an understandings of common and uncommon issues, known and unknown are addressed. It is advantageous as well, that to combat both and exclusion that collaboration and discussion will be vital elements.

The final element present in both Archigram’s magazines and their Instant City project for consideration is the ability to adapt over time. No regimented framework existed that limited the range of the work that Archigram would tackle, in a way making it less about a final result but more about the process of continuous discussion, deliberation, and intervention. By allowing for the ability to evolve and adapt over time, Archigram never lost the battle it faced with the issues of the Architecture of their age but continuously berated it. For a problem that is so engrained in the profession like that of Architecture’s exclusive nature, this ability will be crucial in continuously confronting it.
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Conceptualization
After a close look at the work of the Open City by the Valparaiso school of Architecture and the magazines by Archigram, it is clear to see a wider envelope of collaboration being possible within the architectural realm. From open city, we see the synthesis of an art made by the people in a process to continuously evolve it to a final built form. Within the works of Archigram, we see the collaboration of ideas and theories being developed to challenge the architectural status norm and the ability for non-standard architectural work to foster a change. However, even though both of these projects showcase an understanding of collaboration, they happen within their own realms of exclusion. The Open City only collaborates within the scholastic realm including professors and students. Archigram on the other hand only collaborated within the immediate professional circles, sometimes bringing in engineers and other creatives that they had met. What is then needed is a more open collaborative design process. Looking into the more democratic elements in the works of the Open City and Archigram and applying them to contemporary format. A structured architectural intervention that will better address a more collaborative Architecture.

The vehicle that will then attempt to change the perception of collaboration in Architecture, inviting a wider range of collaboration and addressing the issues of exclusion in Architecture, is The Box. A biannual artist’s residence that will allow for the collaboration of creatives and the sharing of their work to a larger audience.
The first step in addressing the exclusive nature of the box will be location. In part taking inspiration from the Instant City project by Archigram. If collaboration is to be the key component by which exclusion is to be addressed, then it only makes sense to collaborate with as many individuals as possible. By using highways, city boundaries will be traversed, by using rail roads country limits will be traversed, and by using shipping routes continental boundaries will be traversed. The Box will then find itself apparent anywhere and everywhere.

The schedule by which it will operate
will allow for a healthy succession of work. Not becoming stagnant with a stale group but continuously refreshing itself in inviting new creatives. For four months out of the year, the group of creatives will work collectively to a single goal of a completed project, decided by them during the early stages of their residency. In this regard, The Box takes lessons from Archigram’s cyclical nature, which allowed it to evolve more naturally. While this is happening, the location for the next residency will be announced and applications will be accepted by creatives as individuals or within groups. The completion of the project after the four-month period will be signified with a showcasing of the work for a three-week period, after which the box will transport itself to its new location.

In the hopes of creating a more cohesive thesis project, the theoretical schedule of The Box will be analysed over a one-year time period. This period will begin at the end of January, where The Box will arrive in Toronto for its four-month preparation period. After which, the work created by those within the The Box will be showcased during the summer month of June, taking advantage of the influx of people who may experience it during those months. The Box will then pack up in July and repeat the process in Miami, where it will benefit from its December showcasing during Art Basel.

Not limiting itself however to the tactile, digitally interactive models of the works will be shared on thebox.com, allowing for discourse and discussion on the sites forums. In doing so, not only will interest be increased, but the exclusive relation that comes with not being able to reach it will be addressed. In learning from the work of the Open City, the forums will help foster creative discourse and learning. This is not to say that the digital aspect of The Box will allow for all to experience it equally, but it will help give an interpretation to a larger audience.

The design exercise then becomes that...
of creating the space that will facilitate this cross disciplinary collaboration. What tools will be found within the space to optimize the collaboration between the creative and the efficiency of their output. How will the modules of the box come together in forming these spaces that will be inviting for those working within it, and those whose built environment it will inhabit.
Notes

04 Case Studies
The artist residence designed by Pía Mendaro is an exquisite refurbishment showcasing the transformative ability of a space when properly designed. Completed in 2007, the row house is hugged by gardens on either side as one traverses through the site, and was meant to maintain its character after the refurbishment. The design proceeded with the intent of allowing for an array of different types of artist to create in the space, as well as have the space be operable as that of an exhibition.

The design is simple, with the primary focuses of the program being that of working and exhibition, the majority of the space was dedicated to that as opposed to living and amenity spaces. The ground floor houses an adaptable space for both the creation of work as well as exhibiting work. A pulley system above allows for the equipping of tables and swings to further the adaptability of the space for different work environments. The remaining program is nestled away within the peripheries of the space, with a staircase that doubles as storage leading to a mezzanine level living space.

It is clear that the architects understood not only the programmatic elements necessary for creating a successful space, but also, the balance between them. As well, understanding their limitations allowed for them to optimize it as best as possible, with its multifunctioning primary space. It is here we also see the necessity for adaptability in the creation of artist residences. With their varying approaches and mediums, tailoring spaces to meet a varying degree of artist approaches result in the creation of malleable spaces, and it is here that the artist residence by Pía Mendaro excels.
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The observatories are a pair of rotating small shed-like structures, completed in 2015, acting as an artist residence in the south western region of the United Kingdom. The project came about as a competition won by four students, hoping to create creative beacons within the plain landscapes that the observatories find themselves in. In its realization, The Observatory is meant to move to four different locations throughout a 2 year time span, inviting a total of 12 artists to make use of the space for 2 month intervals.

The structure is composed of two relatively small shed-like spaces. The first, being a more open one, acts as workshop that is intended for the artist to create their pieces in as well as hold workshops, if they see fit. The second structure, known as the study, is a more private space and acts as both the sleeping quarters and research area for the artist.

The versatility of the spaces allows for the artists to edit the spaces as they see fit. The metal base and turn wheel in each of the structure allows for the artist to orient the sheds to best suit their creative desires; be it a space facing the sunrise, a space optimized for northern lighting, or a sleeping quarters that faces to workshop in order to garner inspiration.

The simple, yet transformative design, evokes an understanding and appreciation of spaces that may inspire artist to create and work. Although not a grand artist residence in size or number of participants, The Observatory’s prowess lies in its skill to create a transformable space for a variety of artists to flourish!
Notes


2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.
The final residence assessed is the Est-Nord-Est artists’ residence. It is a magnificent purpose-built space designed by Bourgeois / Lechasseur Architectes and located a short 1 hr drive from Quebec City in Saint-Jean-Port-Joli village. The village has a long history of wood carving and in the early 1990’s, what began as a social gathering of artists soon turned into the creation of Est-Nord-Est. After decades of operating through repurposed spaces found within the village, Est-Nord-Est put together an architecture competition for their new purpose built artist residence, and the new contemporary building was completed in 2019.

The design of the residence is simple yet still maintains an air of sophistication. The pitched roof and metal facades allow for the building to blend into the existing fabric of the village. However, the inside is far from simple. A contemporary look can be appreciated from the common spaces, workshops, as well as the artist’s individual’s rooms, each with a bedroom mezzanine and skylight.

As the only purpose built artist residence housing more than one artist in my case studies, what is important to note is the differentiation between the artist’s personal space and common space. One could argue that Bourgeois / Lechasseur Architectes had an exquisite understanding of these values when the building is analyzed. The main entrances of the residence are met immediately by the common space kitchen, dinning room, living room, courtyard, and staircase to the lecture space. The layout thus encourages the artists to interact and possibly foster new skills, relations, or interests through these shared spaces. This motif is taking even further as the larger metal, wood and assembly studios are found at the centre of the project. The residence allows for the artist to use their individual spaces for work, as well as these shared studios, to once again help foster relationships between the different artists.

The Est-Nord-Est Artists’ residence thus does an incredible job at both inspiring artist to develop their crafts in the residence along the saint Lawrence river, as well as encouraging the artist to interact and develop alongside one another during their stay.
1. Entrance
2. Kitchen
3. Dining Room
4. Living Room
5. Office
6. Conference Room
7. Landing Place
8. Assembly Studio
9. Wood Studio
10. Technicians Office
11. Metal Studio
12. SAS
13. Mechanical Room
14. Laundry
15. Bathroom
16. Artist Studio
17. Lecture Area
18. Courtyard

Figure 44: Floor Plan Level 2 1:250
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Programmatic Conclusion

When looking at the lessons learnt from the art residence case studies, one must note the programmatic make up of the spaces. When analysed using these three case studies, the program of an artist residence can be boiled down to 6 key components. These spaces are a space for craft, a space for living, communal space, management, amenities, and a gallery space. It is not necessary to have every component of these programs present, and often, as seen in many of the case studies, spaces house more than one program in an effort to balance the cyclical nature of an artist residence.

Of these spaces, two of the most essential ones are the creative craft space and the living quarters. The craft space is meant for the artist to create and develop outside their normal creative environments, and act as an impetus for many artists to want to go to an artist residence. The living quarters also helps to create a sense of adjustment from their regular work environments. The communal space helps to allow artists to interact with each other as well as the public, fostering more opportunities for development, while the gallery helps engage the public in the work of the creatives. The final two spaces, although less involved in the creative process, are essential to the successful operation of the residence. The amenities address the artists’ need while the managerial space makes sure the residence is functional.

The programmatic approach that the box will then take needs to adjust itself to maintain these elements within its limited amount of space, similar to Pía Mendaro.1 A self imposed limit of four containers will be adhered to in order to maintain a sense of feasibility. That being said, The Box also finds itself in an interesting position. Unlike the majority of artist residences that invite artist to come to them, The Box finds itself making its way to artists, in a similar manner to The Observatories.2 It is then due to this that the selection of programs will not contain a living space for the artist but for the manager, making The Box act as more of a working environment for the artist than a living quarters.

The programs included in The Box will then contain a gallery, managerial living quarters, amenities, communal spaces for the artists and a craft space for them to work. Within the confines of a self-imposed four container limit then, the program becomes allocated as one container housing the gallery space that may be the initial contact the public make with The Box, two containers for a mix of craft and communal space, similar to Est-Nord’Est,3 and lastly, a container housing the living quarters for the manager as well as amenities. The balance between the programs aims to create the optimal space within the confines of the design requirements, taking lessons from all of the artist’s residence analysed and implementing them.

Figure 48: Programs Resolved Through Case Studies

Notes
05 Charrette
The Box Charrette: Toronto

In an attempt to demonstrate the capabilities of The Box as an agent of collaboration between creatives of different backgrounds, a type of mock trial was completed for the project. Taking place in Toronto Ontario, the process began first with artist that were not acquainted with one another meeting at a loft. The participants for this trial run were Minsoo Koh; a film director/dancer who had been working within Toronto for the last few years, Adrienne Matheuszik; a freelance contemporary/installation artist, Jenelle Lewis; a freelance illustrator/musician, and lastly, Jon Kereliuk; a musician/producer who has a background in software engineering.

Shortly after their arrival, the creatives were briefed with a presentation of how The Box would operate, as well as a hypothetical design brief for if the Box were to arrive at Toronto with them as the selected artists. After the presentation and brief, the creatives seemed to understand the requirements and operations of The Box. In order to not be over bearing of their time, the participants were to spend a maximum of two hours on a creative design charrette; the purpose of it being what type of art installation their particular group may create, with their view of the theme (motion) and their shared knowledge.

The process began with each artist explaining their outlook on the theme of motion while sitting around a table that was covered in trace paper and had markers along it. A wide range of ideas and topics were discussed and sketched as the discussion went on. Ideas such as an installation that would augment motion blur, or installation that focused on the struggle for rising artist to be part of Toronto’s culture were discussed among others. With each idea proposed, all participants actively partook in discussing the possible benefits and critiques of the proposal. When needed, questions were asked to clarify the intent of other participants as well as bring up ideas that were inspired by the discussions trajectory. The trace paper that was found in front of each of the participants on the table was instrumental in the clarification, development, and sometimes beneficial misinterpretations of ideas and proposals.

Figure 49: Mock Design Brief created for The Box Toronto
Figure 50: Shared Trace Station Before Charrette
Figure 51: Shared Trace Station During Charrette
Figure 52: Completed Trace
After the two-hour charrette, what came out of the trial run of The Box was then a maze-type structure that was centred on the idea of motion being hindered by the well-renowned game theory known as the Prisoner’s Dilemma. Participants would be able to enter the maze, and at a key point within the center of it, would be prompted by a mobile app as to whether they would either help a stranger into the maze at another entrance enter the central area or not. In the event that both participants allowed the other to proceed, they would be invited to a lower level of the central area; however, if only one of the participants allowed for the other to progress, they would be invited to a higher platform within the centre. As the prisoner’s dilemma states, statistically, the better option would be for both players to allow each other to pass, however, in the eyes of the individual, the better option would be to not allow the other passage in the hopes of reaching the higher platform. For participant 1, if they believe that participant 2 will allow for them to pass, then doing the same will force them into the lower level, and if they believe that participant 2 will deny their progress, they would also deny and have them both exit the maze without experiencing the centre. The ideas developed where then further explored by my own 3D modeling in an attempt to create a more schematic visualisation of the installation.

Simply yet complex, although the art installation does not embody each of the respective art forms of those present at the trial run, it would not have been possible without the collective input of all those present. The shared network of creatives was able to foster an idea that both uses Architecture as well as refraining from conforming to the exclusionary nature that Architecture presents.
The Box Charrette: Sudbury

Continuing on the study on collaboration within groups and with the hopes of clarifying a few aspects within The Box's organization of the creatives involved, another charrette was completed, this time within Sudbury. Within the last charrette, what became clear was that with a singular theme and motif, the artist could clearly express what they thought of that theme and work together towards a single goal. However, if The Box's goal is to not only encourage cross disciplinary collaboration but as well encourage discussion and engagement from the public at each location it visits, the importance of the theme or what The Box asks of its residents may need to be questioned.

With that in mind, the second iteration of The Box charrette asked its creatives to not only create and art installation to be showcased in Sudbury, but as well asked that the installation answer the question of what could The Box do for Sudbury. It was clear in the previous charrette that took place in Toronto that the artists gravitated to what they had in common, being the city that they found themselves in. Unfortunately, for this iteration of The Box charrette, there were less individuals present. The creatives that were involved were a pianist who is also a doctor, an Architecture student, and myself.

Beginning with the question of what The Box could do for Sudbury, the charrette started with the participants describing their outlooks on the city of Sudbury. What exactly made the city more appealing to them, or conversely, what they found unpleasant about it. Focusing more on the latter, the discussion began to look at the general infrastructure of the city of Sudbury. The wide spread net it casts in a very inefficient manner and sprawl were deeply rooted in many unpleasant experiences the creatives and myself were involved in. However, these issues were stepped away from as a majority of the population in Sudbury seem to have vehicles, and in doing so are not plagued by them by participating in the apparent car culture.

The next root we began to discuss was the social groups within the city already idolize the booming years of Sudbury's mining industry as a time where the city and the downtown core were in a much livelier state. That being said, there seems to be less of a lively nature. This may be in part due to the car culture limiting interaction and increasing seclusion.
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The discussion then shifted into one about the way people view Sudbury. Not just those from Sudbury but those from outside Sudbury. Imagery, identity, and iconography became integral parts of the discussion at this point. The city's lack of iconography, other than that of the stack, as well as the vast range of imagery people associate with parts of the city from the Donavan to the New Sudbury district. It was then here that the beginning of an art installation was formed.

The art installation formed was then aimed to question one's perception of the city. It would document specific locations, asking individuals to comment on their day to day lives. Each participant would then be represented and showcased as only a portion of their daily activities, a portion of a video of them, as well as recreation of site specific elements. Viewers and inhabitants would then be asked to try to place different portions together. What person was completing what task, and which items came from which locations. It is then that the strong association visitors may have to different areas, people, and tasks would come under scrutiny as they realize that the world is not as black and white as they may believe.

What became clear from this iteration of The Box charrette was the focus on the impact of the project. When a simple theme was suggested to the participants as it was in Toronto, ideas were more easily generated. This is not to say that the work produced in either was more beneficial than the other, but that extra time and effort was taken when the theme was both broader and more personal to the participants. Hypothetically, if one was to run a complete version of The Box, what may be more beneficial to ask of the participants would be the later question. By asking them what The Box may do for their city, a more impactful project may make itself apparent within the two-month time frame the artist are allowed to create in. In developing these charrettes and implementing lessons and ideas of collaboration from both Archigram and Open City, the collaborative approach of the charrettes helped further the understanding of how The Box may operate.
Design Synthesis
With the continuing development of the thesis project and the hypothetical process of The Box, it was only natural that it needed to be developed and altered with new information and insight. What was understood from the charrettes that were acting as trial runs of The Box’s collaborative elements was the artists’ ability to operate towards a shared goal. However, although executable in the short charrette format, the artist thought and discussed the existing bi-annual schedule of The Box and its issues for artists with busier schedules or existing professional engagements.

This agreed upon by the artist present at both the Toronto charrette and Sudbury charrette. Taking away a four-month window for the lessons they may possibly learn at The Box, even if it came with a stipend income, seemed enjoyable, but a very privileged opportunity for many who would loose work in that time. It is not that they did not want to participate in such an opportunity, but felt they would not be able to afford the consequences it would have on their professional careers.

It is due to this that the schedule needed to be adapted. The new schedule would be focused on a four-month cycle instead of a six month cycle this time around. Meaning that artist would only need to work together in the residence for a two-month period, before a one-month showcasing of their project, and then finally a one-month period for The Box to disassemble from the site and be assembled at the next.

As this is taking place however, a person with a managerial position that accompanies The Box will be organizing The Box’s next location. As seen in the timeline, after a city is announced, an analysis of possible sites takes place as well as a registration period and the selection process for the artist. By having the two events work in tandem, the cycle is forever evolving, as well as optimizing itself for future locations. Ultimately, the cycle process will allow for a natural evolution and continuous improvement for the creatives and locations The Box will arrive at.
Not shown on the calendar however is the introductory project that the artists will take part in. Their first interaction will take place during the site analysis portion of The Box, to be discussed in later sections. Although this is their first joint interaction after being selected, it will be done digitally. So as to allow the artist and community that the Box is in to come together in an introductory manner, the first week of the artist residence will be focused on the creation of a tower like structure.

Not to be confused with the artist installation that will come about by the end of The Box’s stay, the towers are to act as boundaries between the regular everyday life and the collaborative environment of The Box. Acting as a visual cue from a distance, creating a sense of interest and yearning as one approaches, the towers will be constructed by the artists, with materials collected from the community and consultation from the manager.

The towers will vary from location to location, such as monolithic structures created from discarded furniture within the area, to quilted fabric structures looming over the site by fan powered bases to be projected on. That being said, regardless of their materiality, they will function as visible beacons to the site and tools of engagement for the artists and community. Ultimately, creating intrigue and curiosity as one approaches the site.
The Container

Typically, containers come in an assortment of standardized sizes. The most common being the 20ft long and 40ft long containers, in both the standard 8.5ft tall height as well as the high cube 9.5ft tall heights. However, although these are the most common varieties of containers, many alternative designs are available that allow for shipping within the existing system. Some of these include refrigerated containers, tank containers for liquids, and flat rack containers to name a few. What is common among all of these containers however are two key features. The first is the structural makeup of the containers that allow for them to rigidly support one another, and the second are the corner fitting that allow for the containers to be assembled and transported through the various mechanics in place for the shipping systems. In understanding this, not only can a modified container be created that will operate within the existing shipping system, but this information can be used in order to create new systems that will help the modularity of The Box. However, before undergoing that, what is needed is a modification of space within the containers.

Figure 61: Drawings of Different Shipping Container Types

After establishing a refined approach for how The Box would operate in a nomadic manner and understanding the make up of the shipping containers that were to be used, what was necessary to develop next was the feasibility of the containers in housing the requirements of the architectural program. Similarly to the Observatories, its traveling nature meant that it would activate and engage the sites it would find itself within. As well, the containers needed to be designed to allow the artists some agency in the creation and organization of their spaces, similarly to Pia Mendaro and Est-Nord-Est. It is due to this that the expansion and contraction of the space became integral to the design of the containers.
With all containers, no matter the type or length, there is a constant width within the designs. This proves difficult for programming as they create considerably narrow spaces. After some initial research and insight into how the space could be optimized through expansion, what was discovered was scissor fold technology created by Ten Fold Technology. It was using this technology that the containers were able to almost double in square footage, allowing for a greater range of use than the narrow corridor of the typical 40ft containers. However, with the expansion, the exterior edge of the container becomes one that spans a large distance. A bracing was needed to be designed in order to sustain such a large span.

Continuing on with that design language, the top portion of the containers was modified in order to allow for operable skylights to open and close. With the way shipping containers are distributed, it is necessary to maintain a flat top for the shipping of the containers. It is due to this that a mechanically operable sky light system was designed, which would not only brighten the space but allow for light to help the artists in the creation of their work.
After the initial design of the containers was completed, what was needed to be looked at was a system of details for not only how the containers would sit on the site but how they would connect with one another. Fortunately, the containers already possessed a corner fitting which was discussed earlier. It is in taking advantage of this that the details for how the containers will sit on the site, connect to neighbouring units, and attach to supplementary components will be developed.

When discussing the ground connections in the design, we can first and foremost look the four corner fittings that sit closest to the ground. By using a twist lock that is already prevalent in the transportation of containers as a basis, a non invasive foundation can be designed. The twist lock is attached to an 8inch concrete block using a threaded rod to adjust height and level the containers. Similarly, the expanded portion of the container has a connection to a concrete foundation with an adjustable threaded rod using the same twist lock on a mimicked corner joint.
After establishing both the ground connections and expansion of the box, what followed was a focus on optimizing the exterior space on the site. By using the corner fittings once again, shading structures are developed in order to expand the limits of the programmable space from just the interior container space to the adjacent exterior spaces. For moister climates that experience rain more frequently, a tarp-like canopy was designed in order to protect from the element. However, in cooler, less moist climates, a slatted shading system was developed in order to allow for limited amounts of sunlight to enter the covered spaces.

It is with these systems then that The Box finds itself with a modular kit of parts, ready to adapt to different sites in a variety of ways. It is also here that the site analysis will play a major role as to how this kit of parts activates the different sites.
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As mentioned previously, after developing the details for The Box, what is necessary for every site is the analysis process. It is no surprise that the organizational patterns and layouts of a space’s program affects those inhabiting it. Not only that, any aspect of the built environment will have, to a degree, an affect on its neighbouring environment. Taking into account the living arteries created by the populous inhabiting the area, the access points into the site, the vantage points of the site and the existing nature of the environment; architectural interventions can be considered for the programmatic arrangement of The Box to best suite the arriving artists.

After the initial analysis, what will develop is a series of architectural solutions proposing the arrangement of space for The Box in that city, shown briefly following this. It is at this point that the artist that have been chosen for The Box residence are brought into the discussion in order to best develop a space for them and the community. This will help create a space that aims for the best outcome of the project, allow for the artist to get in contact with one another before the actual residency, as well as foster a wider range of collaboration between the artistic side of The Box and the architectural side of it. After site research that took place in Miami, what follows is how The Box’s method would act in a particular site there.

The Miami site is located within the centre of the now bustling Wynwood Neighbourhood, a declining industrial sector that has re-branded itself as a creative art hub within Miami. Now a cultural centre booming with art galleries, restaurants, bars, breweries, and littered with murals on almost all the walls, the Wynwood neighbourhood still houses many vacant lots and old empty warehouses. One of these vacant lots will be the location of The Box in Miami.

The lot is met at the south by NW 24th St and on the west by NW 2nd Ave, the major road that goes through the entirety of the Wynwood Area. It is these two streets that act as the urban arteries, carrying not just the people who walk the Wynwood area on a daily basis but the transportation of vehicles as well, as there appeared to be a culture of showboating vehicles down NW 2nd Ave. The only two access points and vantage points are found on these streets, however, due to the building located at the intersect of the two roads, a tunnel type condition is created on the site, and it is this condition that informs many of the urban strategies for The Box on this site.
The first of these strategies involves maximizing the site area to be used by the creatives. The gallery program finds itself closer to the west end of the site, where it will garner the attention of the busier intersection. It is then that the work studios for the creation of craft find themselves closer to the NW 24th St. The living quarters for the management position is tucked away and the program all comes together to transform the majority of the site into a courtyard to be used by the creatives and management. Although this approach blends well with the urban fabric in maintaining frontages along the streets, it seems to be limiting the possibility of the courtyard being not just a space for the artists and management but the public as well.
The second approach focused on creating a corridor language on part of the site. This would mean the gallery and managerial spaces would be closer to the main street towards the west, while the studio spaces for the creatives would be tucked further away in the back. This would allow for a small courtyard space to be created between the two different containers section, as well as corridors between each container and the one parallel to it. A shaded section, shown in blue, will help to denote this space separately from that of the corridor. Although the initial approach lacked an inviting nature, the corridor like layout invites the public to be curious about what may be happening with The Box.

The final approach developed is one that tries to emulate the existing corridor nature of the site into the design. The western container houses the gallery space in an attempt to give of an inviting aura to both the people along the western and southern streets. The eastern parallel containers house the studio space, once again, creating a covered corridor condition between them. Lastly the residential compartment for the managerial position is situated on the north-eastern corner of the site.

After compiling this assortment of urban strategies, what The Box would then do is invite the artist to digitally partake in their input on the architectural approaches. Asking for not only their artistic input, but inviting them to comment on the architectural affects of the orientation. In a sense, creating an architectural kit of parts to further broaden the collaborative range of The Box.
Figure 78 - 81: Axonometric of 100m radius around Miami site. Highlighting the Activation of the Site Before, During, and After The Box.
It is after all this that the cyclical nature of the box can be pictured clearly, beginning first with an understanding of how people use the area as it presently stands. After this, an understanding of the site is developed, and all the components previously discussed come together to help activate it. The beacon like towers, the programmatic containers, and the people within the surrounding being pulled into the site. It is then here that the achievement of the box can be witnessed, as it leaves the vacant lot that once stood there in place of a more active site.

Notes
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After The Box completes its stage at Miami, it begins to make its way towards Toronto in preparation for its operation there. Unlike the Miami site, the Toronto site is not within such an already active location. The Toronto site is located just north of DuPont station, on the periphery of what many consider the “downtown” area of Toronto. Slightly contrary to the bustling skyscrapers environment some 15 minutes south of the site, the low-lying built landscape directly around the site allow for a more relaxed feeling.

The lot that will be used has its primary road, Spadina Rd on its western side. As the usually bustling Spadina street in Toronto is not very active this far north of the downtown core. North of the site lies Macpherson Ave. To the south is both the railway as well as Dupont St., however, a tree line blocks any visual connection from Dupont St. to the site. It is due to this, as well as Spadina going under a tunnel to pass the train tracks, that the sight’s vantage points are limited to the northern street. As well, the tunnel along Spadina creates a topographical difference in height, reducing access to the sight to be only allowed from Macpherson Ave. In considering the limited access to the site from the single entry point, the three design schemes presented were developed.
The first design approach consists of dividing the narrow site in a sectional fashion using the containers. This approach would create a segmented atmosphere on the site, differentiating the different programs with minor corridors between them. This would also maximize the covered area between the containers acting as additional space for the creatives to use. The segmented nature may also help in the separation of different task zones for the creatives, however, that may come at the cost of a more interactive space.
The second approach intends to create a long corridor type of condition along the site. The south-western most container would house the galley space, once again inviting the public to view the works of past creatives. The following two containers to the east would be the work shop spaces, with the canopy covering the space in-between those containers also helping differentiate the space between the public gallery and the residents work space. Tucked away on the eastern position is the living quarter for the managerial position with a courtyard space across it for the artist to work. This approach augments a larger work space with the two work studios being directly across from each other, as well as encouraging the interaction between the selected artists and the managerial position and the manager must cross the studio spaces to approach the gallery.

The final approach aims to maximize the courtyard condition between the containers. Positioning the eastern container parallel to Spadina Rd., it houses the gallery which will be seen as those coming towards the site from Spadina will see it first. The north western container houses the living quarter for the managerial position. It is then that the eastern containers house the studio. The canopies on either side of the approach act differently. The one closer to gallery acts as more of an entry way, where as the eastern one acts to expand the working space that the creatives will be using.
Figure 88: Axonometric of Programmatic Division of Containers.
Figure 89: Rendered Axonometric of Studio

Figure 90: Rendered Axonometric of Workshop
Figure 91: Rendered Axonometric of Gallery
Figure 92 - 95: Axonometric of 100M Radius Around Toronto Site. Highlighting the Activation of the Site Before, During, and After The Box.
Once again, The Box would compile these approaches to then invite the creatives to deliberate on which may suit their creative endeavours the best, and the elapsed effects of the box can be witnessed. As well, the way the site activates can be explored in more detail, with the morning hours of the day creating a somewhat less intriguing site. The site will still remain inviting with its open concept, gallery space, and beacons; however, the less active morning hours will allow the artists to focus more on the creation of their work. It is in turn then that the evening hours will allow for The Box to operate in a livelier nature. With lights now illuminating the site and the beacons to truly express themselves, the more active evening environment will operate to allow the artist and community to better interact.
Conclusion

From the start of this project to its completion, The Box, as a vehicle of change, has continuously evolved and shaped itself to what is seen here. Developing on the ideas of exclusion with regards to who Architecture is made for, who can make Architecture, and lastly, who can be inspired by Architecture. Who can make Architecture is challenged as a variety of artists come together to help shape the ways in which The Box will inhabit, and subsequently effect the urban fabric it finds itself in. Who Architecture is made for as well as who can be inspired by Architecture are addressed in the nomadic nature of The Box, allowing it to effect as wide a range of people as possible. Ultimately, what the box aims to do is utilise the possibilities of collaboration and inclusion to their limits; in an effort to create a more inclusive architectural process.


