PHASE ONE  STUDIO PREPARATION

STARTS  Monday 27 August
INTERIM R  Friday 7 September @ 2:15 PM
DUE  Monday 10 September at 2:15PM

TEAM WORK  This phase demands students to operate in groups of 2 and 4 individuals (see below).

THEORETICAL CONTEXT  The following readings will provide you with the reflective context to contemplate your precedent and project studies. These readings are to be done by each group of 4 students.

First week:
Affluenza (http://www.affluenza.org/)

Second week:
When I die, recompose me, TED Talk by Katrina Spade (https://www.ted.com/talks/katrina_spade_when_i_die_recompose_me)

Product: informal discussions moderated by faculty culminating in a one-page (500 words) summary statement and a 15 minute PPT presentation.

PRECEDENTS  Teams of 2 students will collect the information and then study the general conditions characterizing the assigned 3 precedents (assigned by lottery):
Team 1 (graduate)
- Gunnar Asplund, the Woodland Cemetery, Stockholm, Sweden
- Steven Holl, Taiwan ChinPaoSan Necropolis (https://www.archdaily.com/555859/steven-holl-granted-approval-for-taiwan-chinpaosan-necropolis-scheme)

Team 2
- Gunnar Asplund, the Woodland Cemetery, Stockholm, Sweden

Team 3
- Aldo Rossi, Columbarium, Modena, Italy
- Fieldoffice, Cherry Orchard Cemetery, Taiwan (https://www.architectural-review.com/buildings/cherry-orchard-cemetery-by-fieldoffice-architects-a-subtle-conversation-between-man-and-nature/10014125.article)

Team 4 (graduate)
- Pekka Pitkänen, Holy Cross Crematorium, Turku, Finland
- Le Corbusier, Ronchamp Chapel, France

Team 5

Team 6 (graduate)
- Carlo Scarpa, Brion Cemetery, Treviso, Italy (https://www.architectmagazine.com/design/tattoos-and-tombs-carlo-scarpas-great-small-architecture)
- Tadao Ando, Water Temple, Awaji Island, Japan
Team 7

- Enric Miralles, *Igualada Cemetery*, Barcelona, Spain  
  (https://www.archdaily.com/103839/ad-classics-igualada-cemetery-enric-miralles)
- atelierjones, *Bellevue First Congregational Church*, Bellevue, WA
- Furumori Koichi, *Myoenji Columbarium*, Iizuka, Fukuoka, Japan  

More precedents (for those that want to go wider or deeper):

- Frank Lloyd Wright, *The Blue Sky Mausoleum*, Buffalo, New York
- Studio Zermani, *Sansepolcro Cemetery*, Arezzo, Italy  
- Carme Pinos, *New Crematorium, Igualada Cemetery*, Barcelona, Spain  
- Tadao Ando, *Church on the Water*, Tomamu, Japan
- Alvar Aalto, *Lyme Crematorium*, competition entry
- Sigurd Lewerentz, *Resurrection Chapel, Forest Cemetery*, Stockholm
- Jorn Utzon, *Bagsvaerd Church*, Copenhagen
- Luis Barragan, *Los Clubes (San Cristobal Stables and The Fountain of Lovers)*, Mexico City
- Francisco Bielsa, *Cementerio del Este*, Caracas, Venezuela  
  (http://zona-arquitectura.blogspot.com/2013/07/funeralia-monumentalcaracasvenezuela.html)

**Product:** Your work should be formatted to fit in 20”x20” sheets. While digital technology is a logical choice, students are encouraged to employ hand-diagrams over transparency paper to study the given buildings. Consider the short time given, the theoretical underpinnings, the building program and context to strategize your analytical approach.

**SITE**

The location of our project is the Washington Bonney-Watson Memorial Park, straight east of the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, Seattle, WA. You can google the location using this address: *16445 International Blvd., Seat Tac, WA 98188*.

There are site plans, photographs, and more in our studio G-drive. More details will be provided in class.
Understanding our place demands considerations of space, scale, history, nature, landscape, use, traffic, accessibility, visibility, context, experience, etc. Another point of reflection is the size and shape of the given lot. What kind of natural, socio-cultural, functional, and experiential zones overlap on it? Is there a particular pattern to follow? What about the major tensions informing-deforming the conditions? What is invisible yet essential to most people about the site conditions?
You will be assigned to one of the following tasks. Each job will be done by a group of 2 students

- **Cultural/Historical:** Culture: institutions, community values, and cultural fabric; Historical: time, memory, and events. (Team A)
- **Functional:** activities, accessibility, human/transportation flow. (Team B-graduate)
- **Environmental:** weather, seasons, climate, sun, shadow, wind, rain, etc. (Team C)
- **Formal/Spatial:** third person, detached considerations of massing (man-made and natural), scale, figure-ground, light (Sun), context, section/topography, etc. (Team D and E, one graduate)
- **Experiential:** first person, embodied, phenomenological (i.e., NOT analytical) study of the site as it appears to a person arriving, moving, staying, and leaving it. Use the provided photos and other appropriate information. Consider the full sensorium. (Team F)
- **Site Documentation & rough model:** utilize provided data/information to build an 2D and 3D digital model for laser-cutting a good physical model (and also for rendering) at a scale to be defined later on. Additionally, in the meantime, produce a rough physical model documenting the general conditions for use by all students during first two weeks of architect Jones’ visit. (Team G-graduate)

**Examples**

*Find examples of this type of work in the following web link:*

http://juliobermudez.com/courses/202/site-analysis/

**Product**

Each group will produce two 20”x 20” visual compositions, representing their findings on the site. Utilize diagrammatic, conceptual, photography, and/or drawings as well as notations to carry out and communicate your analytical work. Media is up to you.

**GRADE**

10 % of the course grade
PHASE ONE  STUDIO PREPARATION

Understanding the program

STARTS  Friday 7 September
DUE  Monday 10 September

LAYER ONE  Still working with your partner(s), based on the building program, develop the most fundamental action that will take place in each one of the programmed space (notice that it may include an action that starts or relates to the vicinity of your project). The action (verb) must be put into some sort of context. (“Sitting” is a meaningless verb without some kind of qualification; why am I sitting? (Working at a computer at my job is very different from sitting at the dinner table, or in a soft chair to read a book.)

Elaborate each action with a list of qualitative and subjective requirements for the space in which the activity will take place (quality of light, tallness, sound, temperature, memory, color, vastness, kinds of materials, level of material articulation, privacy, view, air movement, etc.). Where possible, also note any relationships between actions in terms of: connections to other actions (not simply adjacencies, but RELATIONSHIPS; how does this affect that?); hierarchies among a set of actions; or relationships to EXTERNAL conditions.

What we are asking you to do is not to make judgments about space sizes and adjacencies, but to develop an attitude (or architectural position) about spatial qualities and relationships. By thinking more directly about the actions of the inhabitants, this should allow you to begin thinking about the architectural qualities that you might want to create in response to their actions. Consider all this based on the particular situation of mourning, death, celebration, and so on. This document anticipates some aspects of the design process by attempting to describe the qualities that you think the spaces of your project should have.

LAYER TWO  Before you start the diagrams for this second layer, first build the total gross square footage as a solid box placed on the site. This will show you how the program would fill
the site if it were packed tightly together. Keep this model as a visual tool to maintain your understanding of the program scale.

Now you can start to do the following (this will be your ‘second layer’):

- **produce some sort of graphic three-dimensional conceptual model of the program**.

This should not be a precise model that attempts to translate the square footage of each component directly. Instead, the diagram should focus on **the most important relationships** embedded in your program vis-à-vis the inevitable (fundamental) rituals to unfold. How distinct is inside/outside? Is the program actually fixed or will it mutate over time? What parts of the program want to be two-three stories high (if any) and which want to be single story spaces? How does the contour may play with that? Where are the significant in-between, un-programmed spaces? What parts should gravitate towards the center or the edge? Do some parts intersect others? Should parts be broken down into smaller components and dispersed? To what extent should the relationships between parts be chaotic or simple? Are edges hard or soft? *Pay particular attention to circulation vis-à-vis ritual/access/visit and the relation between indoor and nature, outdoors.*

You should produce at **three** different 3D (hand drawn, digital, or physical) diagram. They should fit into a flat working base 12”x18” (about 1/16” = 1’-0” scale). If you need you may have one of these diagrams to be just 2D (in order to get going).

Obviously, the relative proportions of things may influence the way you make the drawing, but it is CRITICAL to understand that this diagram is a way to abstractly begin to unpack the program. These diagrams will allow you to understand the relative scale and impact on the site as well as compare internal relationships. It is NOT in any way a direct precursor to the generation of form.

**NOTE 1:** As you consider these two layers, make sure you begin to consider your philosophical/design position regarding death in today’s society/culture.