Introduction

Statement

Our objective is to study the differences between cohousing ‘types’ in differing cultures eg. Western European and American. We feel that through discussing the strengths and weaknesses of successful communities in different contexts, it may be possible to create a working ‘prototype’ that combines the strengths of said communities.

Cohousing Comparison
Introduction

What is Co Housing?

We have defined, for the purposes of this investigation, Co Housing is a group of people with intentions of strengthening their sense of social interaction and community.

Awareness

- strengthening of community
- lessening of ecological footprint
- increase in interpersonal interaction
- awareness and acceptance of diversity, both cultural and personal choice
- opposition to suburban sprawl and related disconnect with society and the earth
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Introduction

For the purposes of this investigation we have divided various cohousing communities into three categories based on their context and architectural organization and construction:

- Adaptive Reuse
- Urban
- Rural [suburban]
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Cohousing Comparison
Caroline-Herschel Strabe

General Information

Wogeno Mnchen
Established December 2001
16 units
Munich, Germany
URBAN CASE STUDY

SOCIAL ISSUES

LIVE/ WORK COMMUNITY

TYPICAL URBAN DESIGN INTEGRATES
COHOUSING INTO MUNICH'S EXISTING
'FABRIC'

FOCUS ON DIVERSITY OF AGE
(1-71)

SIMPLE APARTMENT UNITS BRING
NEIGHBORS INTO CONSTANT
INTERACTION

COMMUNITY BRING EACH OTHER
TOGETHER BY CHOICE, NOT
PARTICULARLY BY DESIGN...

REFURBISHMENT DONE USING
COMMUNITY LABOR

COMPACT URBAN STRUCTURE
LEAVES ROOM ON SITE FOR
OUTDOOR COMMUNITY SPACE, BOTH
FOR COHOUSING MEMBERS AND
OUTSIDE CITIZENS.
URBAN CASE STUDY

SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

PV PANELS
SOLAR ORIENTATION
MATERIAL REUSE
SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS AND BUILDING PRACTICES
LOCAL LABOR
AFFORDABILITY OF HOUSING
MINIMALIZATION OF FOOTPRINT "UP NOT OUT"
MAINTAINED "GREEN" SPACES
PROXIMITY TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT
WILLINGNESS TO INVEST IN SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS
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URBAN CASE STUDY

DESIGNING FOR COMMUNITY

TIGHT COURTYARD ENCOURAGES INTERACTION

FLUIDITY OF UNIT DESIGN ALLOWS FOR MAXIMUM ADAPTABILITY

COMMUNITY HOUSE AS PUBLIC ‘HEAD’ CREATES A STRONG PRESENCE FOR THE SURROUNDING AREA

PUBLIC ‘FRONT’ DOORS RARELY USED/ CLOSER ‘BACK’ DOORS ON COURTYARD MORE INTEGRATED INTO CIRCULATION

ALL ELEMENTS OF COMMON HOUSE ARE ADA ACCESSIBLE

PUBLIC FACADE IS RIGID, BUT NOT UNINVITING

COMMON HOUSE EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO OUTSIDE COMMUNITY/ COMMONLY USED AS PUBLIC MEETING HOUSE
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URBAN CASE STUDY

JACKSON PLACE

General Information

MICHAEL PYATOK

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

ESTABLISHED JUNE 2000

27 UNITS

Cohousing Comparison
URBAN CASE STUDY

SOCIAL ISSUES

THE DESIGN INCORPORATED A NUMBER OF SIZES OF UNIT IN ORDER TO PROVIDE THE ABILITY FOR A DIVERSITY OF ECONOMIC RANGES

CHILD SAFETY BECAME AN IMPORTANT DESIGN DRIVE [TERRACE MATERIALS STILL IN FLUX]

AGE RANGE WAS IMPORTANT TO THEIR VALUES AND MAKING CHILDREN AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE COMMUNITY

4 COMMUNAL MEALS A WEEK PROVIDES A LARGE AMOUNT OF COMMUNITY INTERACTION

IT WAS IMPORTANT THAT THE 'FACADE' OF THE COMMUNITY WAS INVITING AND AGREEABLE TO ITS CONTEXT, BUT MADE CLEAR THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN SEATTLE AND JACKSON PLACE COHOUSING

SMALL 'STREAMS' OF FRONTAL ACCESS ACHIEVE THIS 'SCREEN' OF BUILDING FORM, SHELTERING THE INNER COURTYARD AND WORKING TOWARDS A COMFORTABLE COMMUNITY SPACE.

MOST COMMUNITY INTERACTION OCCURS ON THE TERRACE OF AND WITHIN THE COMMUNITY HOUSE.
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URBAN CASE STUDY

SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

SOLAR ORIENTATION
ACCESSIBILITY
MATERIALS
MAINTENANCE OF "GREEN" SPACES
PROXIMITY TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT
MINIMALIZATION OF FOOTPRINT
*FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS LEAD TO LESS SUSTAINABLE BUILDING PRACTICES AND MATERIAL CHOICES:

NON-LOCAL LABOR
VINYL SIDING
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URBAN CASE STUDY

DESIGNING FOR COMMUNITY

TIGHT COURTYARD ENCOURAGES INTERACTION

FLUIDITY OF UNIT DESIGN ALLOWS FOR MAXIMUM ADAPTABILITY

COMMUNITY HOUSE AS PUBLIC 'HEAD' CREATES A STRONG PRESENCE FOR THE SURROUNDING AREA

PUBLIC 'FRONT' DOORS RARELY USED/ CLOSER 'BACK' DOORS ON COURTYARD MORE INTEGRATED INTO CIRCULATION

ALL ELEMENTS OF COMMON HOUSE ARE ADA ACCESSIBLE

PUBLIC FACADE IS RIGID, BUT NOT UNINVITING

COMMON HOUSE EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO OUTSIDE COMMUNITY/ COMMONLY USED AS PUBLIC MEETING HOUSE
URBAN CASE STUDY

DESIGNING FOR COMMUNITY
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Drejerbanken, Denmark

General Information
Skalbjerg, Denmark
20 units
architect: Arkitekgruppen
completed: 1978
Tenure: private and rental
Common house: 5100ft2

Cohousing Comparison

Rural
Sunlight, Portland

General Information
Portland, Oregon, US
15 units
architect: Church & Maslen
Tenure: Condominium
Site: Suburban, 7.5 acres
RURAL CASE STUDY

Design Issue

Site plan of Sunlight, (Church)
1. Common house
2. Parking
3. Pedestrian street
4. Parking

SITE PLAN
Scale
0 100

Allowable Density
9 Units
6 Units

winter shade line

Site plan: A. common house,
B. furnace building, C. storage
shed, D. vegetable garden,
E. chicken house

Cohousing Comparison

SUNLIGHT, PORTLAND
DREJERBANKEN, DENMARK
RURAL CASE STUDY

Design Issue

Drejerbanken, Denmark
- Houses mostly duplex,
- Clustering together a public central plaza
- Interaction takes place at the courtyard
- Common house at the center, ‘welcoming’ formal entrance for visitors
- Parking next to the common house, do not pass through community

Sunlight, Portland
- Detached single family houses
- Loosely located along a pedestrian street
- Interaction takes place at the small lawn or porch area in front of the houses
- Common house at the end of the pedestrian path, noise problem
- Passing through community before getting to the common house

Common:
Public kitchen, public and private garden
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RURAL CASE STUDY

Sustainable approaches

Drejerbanken, Denmark
- Houses not mainly facing south due to the courtyard layout
- courtyard design protects it from hazardous wind from all directions in winter

Sunlight, Portland
- Houses located along a East West path, with short side of all houses facing South
- Houses largely exposed to North South wind

Commons:
- One to two story high to reduce the shading possibility
- Adequate trees as barriers to reduce wind speeds
- Natural materials: wood
- No active energy approach e.g. solar panels & wind generator
RURAL CASE STUDY

Sustainable approaches

Structural diagram of wing-shaped common house designed by sculptor Niels Guttormsen and architect Jan Gudmand-Heyer.

Sun angles used by Danes and Swedes for low-rise housing provide 4-5 hours of sun in the private and common gathering areas, such as living rooms, and 3 hours in other rooms. The amount of sun is also connected to a specific time; for example, in Denmark kitchens need several hours of
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Social Issue

Drejerbanken, Denmark
- Small work groups handling different task of the whole community
- Participation is voluntary
- Adults & children participation
- jobs based on voluntary basis, according to one’s personal proclivities
- Community spirit demonstrated by high level of volunteerism

Sunlight, Portland
- members have little say about who will be moving in under condominium
- tolerance does not mean the community is conflict free
- But after ten years, the issues are not as complicated as in the beginning, and a rhythm of past decisions guides the community.

Common:
all decisions are made by consensus
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RURAL CASE STUDY

Social Issue

Cohousing Comparison
ADAPTIVE REUSE CASE STUDY

Jernstoberiet, Roskilde, Denmark.

Case Study one

General Information

21 Cohousing units
Architects: Jan Gudmand-hoyer, Jes Edvards, Helge Christiansen
Completed: 1981
Common House and Public Area: 3230 ft2 with a 6500 ft interior court.

Cohousing Comparison
Background

- Located in urban area in Roskilde.
- The original structure was built in 1946 as an Iron Foundry.
- Started with a group called SAMBO
- Creating a community encourages the interaction between neighbors
- Economic issues: investment and construction cost
ADAPTIVE REUSE CASE STUDY

Design Issues:

- Large central hall
- Public and private space under one roof
- Sun light: glass window skylight
- Residents did most of the work, demolition and construction
- Recycle all reusable material
- The old structure confines the design for individual residents.
- 21 residents units but none of them are the same.
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Building plan and section

Cohousing Comparison
Swan's Marketplace, Oakland, CA, USA

General Information
18 Affordable Rental / 20 Co-housing Loft units
Building Ownership: East Bay Asian Local Development Corp.
Year of Completion: 2000
Project Type: Mixed-Income, Mix-Use
Site Area: 60,000 sqft
Retail Area: 31,000 Sqft
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Background

- Located in urban area in Roskilde.
- The original structure was built in 1946 as an Iron Foundry.
- Started with a group called SAMBO
- Creating a community encourages the interaction between neighbors
- Economic issues: investment and construction cost
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Site picture:
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Design Issues:

- Complex design challenge
- Historical preservation: façade and keep 75% of the old structure.
- Design scheme: daylighting into the interior courtyard
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ADAPTIVE REUSE CASE STUDY

Social Issues:

- Complex social interaction, public and private
- Revive the surrounding commercial district
- Affordability

Cohousing Comparison
Prototype Urban

Cohousing Comparison
Prototype Rural

Cohousing Comparison
Prototype  Adaptive Reuse

Cohousing Comparison
Conclusion

US vs. European

1. European: sharing, collaborative communities
   US: collaborate meanwhile more need for individuality
2. Different culture values similar approach of collaboration housing
3. Both US and European aim at creating a socially supportive community for the residents and working together with other households
4. European cohousing has more activities occur in the common houses than US cohousing
5. Both of American and European collaborative examples have managed to blend into the surrounding neighborhood
6. The local government is conspicuously absent in the development of most of the U.S. examples, unlike most European models.