Together Alone
Social student apartments in Gothenburg, Sweden
There is a shortage of student housing in Sweden and more needs to be built. Studies show that students prefer to live in a single household apartment and don't want to share any functions with others. At the same time studies show that many students feel lonely.

In this master thesis I will try to solve this conflict by understanding why students don't want to share functions with others and then find a way around the problem.

Main focus in this project lies on the interiors, the sight lines and the transitions of private and public zones to create an atmosphere that is needed for the students to enjoy living together. Effort is also put on the exterior and the complications that follows of placing a large building in the context of a neighbourhood with smaller villas.

The project is real and the plot is situated in Krokslätt, Gothenburg (Sweden).
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A third reason could perhaps be found in Insurance company Moderna’s research which states that Swedes are the more afraid of conflicts than any other Nordic nationality. Maybe the wish to live alone could also be explained by a fear of having to spend time with people you don’t know and risk ending up in conflicts.

No matter the reasons for the wish to live alone, it seems that the constructing industry is adapting to it. May this development have any negative effects?

Yes I believe it could.

When the students leave out the risk of conflicts by isolating themselves as they do, they also leave out chances of positive meetings and the making of friends. Swedish students are lonely according to Statistics Sweden. Five percent or 16,000 of the Swedish students have no close friend and according to research at the Department of Sociology in Uppsala is loneliness the worst among the young: 60 percent among 20-29 year old feel lonely often or sometimes.

I think these statistics are frightening. If more single household apartments for students will be built as planned, the loneliness among students could worsen. I feel I want to try to change this mindset and make living together something positive for students. In this master thesis I will give a proposal for a student housing where I will try to prevent students from becoming lonely by making them live together in a way that is making it easy to make friends with each other and in that way eliminate the risks for them of having to share functions and spend time with people they don’t know.


3. Itakt med Göteborgs utveckling : Stiftelsen Göteborgs studentbostäder 1951-2001 / Lars O. Carlsson ; SGS-specifik källforskning och text / Kjell Olsson
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Site and massing

The project
A few years back I stayed in a student corridor. The owner of that building, Javad Nami, asked me to draw a proposal for a new student housing that he is planning to build. The new building will be placed next to the building I stayed in as a student. The site is located in the district Krokslätt in Gothenburg, Sweden.
The site is located on a hill south of Gothenburg city centre. The view from the park is great, overlooking the city. A tall building on this site would have the same view. Few people are using the park today.

Javad Naini owns the plot and the two student housing buildings standing on it.

Olofs Höjd. Across the street to the east of the plot lays Olofs höjd. It is Gothenburg’s largest student dorm built in 1960, holding 1,391 dwellings. Olofs höjd includes several buildings with three to four storeys.

The plot for the new building. Javad Naini owns the plot and the two student housing buildings standing on it.

Utlandagatan 39 a. Pale blue wooden house with darker blue shutters. Built in the 1930’s.

Utlandagatan 39 b. Naini agrees on tearing this house down if it is needed in order to build new.

Utlandagatan 41

Walking distances:
18 minutes to Chalmers University of Technology.
12 minutes to Academy of music and drama (GU).
34 minutes to the Central station in the city centre.
Site and massing

Site plan of my proposal.

- Utlandagatan 39 b and the small shed is torn down.
- The new building has a closer connection to the park.
- The sunny back yard is undeveloped and free to be used for recreation for the tenants.
Tower block on top of the hill. This way the building type can hold many students. The building type does not exist elsewhere in the neighbourhood and does not blend in neither with the villas nor Olofs höjd’s lamellas. The building is tall and also standing on a high point in Gothenburg, the building will be seen from far and will change the silhouette of the city. The feeling of urbanity is low when the building has no connection to the street.

A villa by the street. The feeling of urbanity is higher through the building has connection to the street. It is placed at the street and that creates an urban feeling. It blends in well in the neighbourhood but the building is comparatively small and though Utlandagatan 39b has to be torn down in this case this volume does not generate much space.

Lamella on top of the hill. The height is lower than the tower and communicate well with the lamellas of Olofs höjd, but not as well with the villas. The feeling of urbanity is low when the building has no connection to the street.

Lamella by the street. The height is lower than the tower and communicate well with the lamellas of Olofs höjd across the street, but not as well with the villas. Utlandagatan 39b has to be torn down. The feeling of urbanity is higher though the building has connection to the street.

Site and massing
Two buildings with pitched roofs climbing up the hill towards the park. The buildings are a mixture of the lamella and the villa facing the street. It gives both closeness to the park as well as the urbanity of the street. It goes well with both the buildings of Olofs Hjörd, Utlandagatan 39a which it is connected to, and to the surrounding villas. Utlandagatan 39b has to be torn down.
Before leaving for my study trip I made research about which student accommodation to visit. I found fifteen buildings that I considered interesting or/and that was newly built. Below I describe a few of that I visited.

The Bikuben Student Residence
Copenhagen, Denmark
Year: 2006
Architect: Aart

The architects have succeeded well in my opinion in creating a social student accommodation. The students seemed to know each other fairly well and socialized for example when cooking. Each student had a small apartment with both private toilet and kitchenette. The apartments were connected to a corridor and in the middle of the hallway there was a communal kitchen, dining area and a small living-room area. According to one student he used the common kitchen a lot but it was also nice to have a private kitchenette and fridge for when he did not want to be social. The house had plenty of social spaces and outdoor terraces. All the indoor common features like the kitchen, gym and bar were located towards the glazed atrium in the core of the building. All common areas were close to where the students lived and were easily reached by everyone. They seemed used and the kitchen I saw was nice and clean. There was a room dedicated for parties with a large terrace and a bar. The room was untidy and some furniture was broken. The room belonged to everyone in the house. The rent was high, 550 euro not including electricity.

Bispebjerg Student Housing
Copenhagen, Denmark
Year: 2006
Architect: C. F. Møller Architects

Each student had an apartment with separate toilet and kitchen as well as common kitchen in the entrance. On three floors a common space is “floating” in between the apartments. Only the common kitchen at the entrance had a function determined by the builders. The students themselves had chosen to make one room into a TV room with sofas and pillows. The common rooms belonged to all students in the building. They were messy and small but had large windows with great views. According to a tenant they usually only used the kitchen at the entrance for socializing. None of the communal rooms besides the kitchen would you pass by naturally.

Grundfos Dormitory
Århus, Denmark
Year: 2012
Architect: CEBRA

The students live alone or in pairs of two in apartments with both kitchen and bathroom. There are also large common kitchens and living spaces on two floors. There is a 12 story atrium in the middle of the building with mirror clad balcony fronts. The mirrors are transforming the sense of space by expanding the relatively narrow atrium with kaleidoscopic reflections of itself and the people moving through it.

Student Housing Poljane
Ljubljana, Slovenia
Year: 2006
Architect: Bevk Perovic Arhitekti

I visited two student complex in Ljubljana of which one I stayed in during my stay since it was converted into hostel during the summer. In both accommodations the students shared bedroom with one other student. A tenant complained that he had too little privacy and he also thought it was annoying that guests had to pass through one of the bedrooms in order to get to the common areas of the apartment. Common areas were located on the ground floor and did not seem not to be used much. The common areas were large and sterile rooms without any specific function. They were not directly adjacent to the entrance and there was only one entrance to these rooms. The walls were made of glass, which might be good as you see who is in there before deciding whether to enter but you might feel observed once inside. The study room which was on the ground floor as well seemed to be used more. The distance between the residences and the common areas were too large for one to go there by chance.
Reference analyses

Students Apartments
Malmö, Sweden
Year: 2005
Architects: Wikeborg & Sander arkitektur

This project holds small student apartments but no shared spaces. In the apartment I visited the bed was situated on a loft with a ceiling height of 1.8 m at the highest point. At the lowest point by the feet of the bed it was 1 m. The courtyard was very nice and it added to the pleasant atmosphere.

Pavillon Suisse
Paris, France
Year: 1921
Architect: Le Corbusier

Fifteen students live in separate rooms accessed from a general hallway. Each room has a private shower and a washbasin. The students share two toilets and a tiny kitchen which you also access from the hallway. There is a common room for socializing on the ground floor. Most of the common space is corridor.

Le Drakkar
Ecully, Lyon, France
Year: 1993
Architect: Jourda Architectes

Each apartment has a terrace on the ground floor. Two students share one apartment. The entrance floor holds a kitchen with double height ceiling and one bedroom. You access the second bedroom by a staircase from the kitchen. All apartments have a private entrance on the ground floor.

Conclusions

I was disappointed to see how small variety there were in concepts of living in the buildings I went to visit. Pavillon Suisse in Paris by Le Corbusier from 1920 is still a standard way of building student apartments. The biggest difference of today is that there is a larger amount of common areas. Why there is more common areas today I find strange since these areas seemed hardly utilized (in exception for the kitchen) in most of the housings I went to. It was also interesting to see that the only single household apartments without any shared functions I visited was located in Sweden.

The major issues in the student buildings where

The large corridor
Occupies a lot of space and the only use is for communication. The corridor is usually a narrow, sterile and very public space that becomes a barrier for getting to the social areas.

The social areas
The social areas were displaced since they were situated in a way that you would not pass naturally. Also too many people were sharing these rooms and the chances of meeting someone you know were small. When too many students share a certain space it becomes sterile, impersonal and eventually since no one will feel responsible for the space, it also becomes dirty and worn.

Rooms with no function
Several common rooms had no specific function and that makes it an unnatural place to be. Kitchen or study room for example do have functions and therefore work better.
Comparison between the plans of Pavillion Swisse, Student Housing Poljane, and a general Swedish apartment plan.

The problems mentioned about student housing is problems that usually do not occur in regular housing apartments. A reason for that could be that the greater amount of people living together the more guarding do you become of your own private sphere. To be able to get a large group of dwellers to socialize with each other I believe the transformation from a private area to a public has to happen gradually in order to feel safe and actually socialize.

The diagram below demonstrates areas of privacy and publicity in two student corridors versus a general housing plan.

**Pavillion Swisse**
This is a classic student corridor where one student lives in a room directly connected to a very public, long and narrow hallway. The students share both kitchen and toilets. The hallway has no other function than for communication. People are in the hallway only to get to somewhere else. The kitchen should be a place where you spend time and meet people, but it is located too far away from the students private rooms and there is no way of hearing or seeing if there is someone there you might know when you are in your private room. If the kitchen was located right outside of your private room it would actually be better I believe. It is easier to open your door and hear or see who is there from the safety of your home. The gradual transformation from private to public would then be your door just slightly opened. Instead the corridor creates a boundary to the social areas.

**Student Housing Poljane**
Too much socializing. Four students are sharing one apartment. In this student housing there is no private space as they are sharing bedrooms.

**Reference analyses**
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My own experiences of living in student housing.

Utlandagaten 39a, Gothenburg , Sweden

I stayed in this student housing villa for three years when I was beginning my studies in Architecture.

My room including my share in the common areas was 24 sq m. We were four people in my corridor sharing bathroom, kitchen and hallway. The hallway was rectangular with close connections to all the private rooms, bathroom and kitchen which made it easy to peek in and see into all the rooms. We were very seldom socializing at each others private rooms even though some of us got to know each other well. The private rooms were all we had as private and therefore were we careful to enter those areas. The hallway was lit by the kitchen window. The four of us usually had the doors to our private rooms open to be able to hear what was happening in the social areas. The kitchen was very small for four people but at night time it was always crowded by us and our friends socializing together.

The students themselves were a part in the decision of who of the applicants to move in.

Kantorsgatan in The student town Uppsala, Sweden

I stayed in this classically designed corridor for three months but I never got to know my five neighbors I was sharing functions with, some I did not even speak to once.

I had my own room and toilet at 18 sq m. This was not including the social areas such as kitchen, living room, shower and a long and dark hallway. In one end of the hallway was the shower located and in the other end was the kitchen and living room, which was too far away from the private rooms to be able to hear what was happening there. All kitchen utensils were private and the kitchen cupboards were lockable.

No one ever had their doors open.
Public and private and in between

It seems as if the student housings are being unsocial depend on whether the public and the private areas are separated far apart. The housings become unsocial when the private areas has little or no contact (visual and hearing) with the more public areas. Therefore it is important to create a transparent and soft transition between the private and the public areas. A soft transition could be different bridging zones in between the private and the public areas. A bridging zones is a place where you can feel safe of being in your own private/semi private sphere and at the same time be a part of the social. It would make it easier to participate in events with others. Problems of unsocial housings occur in many housings built in between 1965-1975. Jan Gehl wrote about this in his book “Life between buildings Using Public Space”.

“Whether the public environment invites or repels is, among other things, a question of how the public environment is placed in relation to the private, and how the border zone between the two are designed. Sharply demarcated borders - such as those found in multistory residences, where one is either in a completely private territory indoors and upstairs or in a completely public area outside on the stairs, in the elevator, or on the street - will make it difficult in many situations to move into the public environment if it not necessary to do so. Flexible boundaries in the form of transitional zones that are neither completely private nor completely public, on the other hand, will often be able to function as connecting links, making it easier, both physically and psychologically, for residents and activities to move back and forth between private and public spaces, between in and out. Being able to see what is going on in public spaces also can be an element of invitation. If children can see the street or playground from their homes, they also can follow what is happening and see who is outside playing. They are often more motivated to go out and play, in contrast to the children who cannot see what is going on because they live too high up or too far away. Numerous examples that emphasize the relationship between being able to see and the desire to participate can likewise be found among adult activities.”

In a collective student housing it is more important than ever that the dwellers get to know each other to feel safe of sharing household functions. The larger the group of people living close together, as in a student corridor, the more anonymous will they feel and the more guarding will they be of their own private sphere.
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I have been working with inspiration from the ideas of Le Corbusier and Adolf Loos when they projected housing. To be able to follow the similarities with their thoughts in my project follows a short summery of their ideas.

Informations partly taken from Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media by Beatriz Colomina, 1994

Le Corbusier
Le Corbusier is considered modernism’s foremost theorist and one of its main creators. Modernism is characterized by a stripped-down and simple geometric architecture, free of ornaments as it is the very forms and structure that accounts for the architectural and artistic value.

Le Corbusier created volumes rather than walls with holes, for example rows of windows along the whole building volume rather than scattered openings in a single standing wall.

The landscape surrounding the building was important to Le Corbusier. He built houses in a way to create interesting views of the outside.

Adolf Loos
Adolf Loos coined the term Raumplan. With Raumplan Loose means that different room defining elements such as walls, ceiling heights and levels of floors should be determined by the function of the room. The placement of walls, slabs and openings should create certain sight lines and distances needed in order to get the right experience of the room.

Windows in the facade was only to give light and not to frame views, therefore the windows were often covered by thin curtains and sometimes accompanied by a mirror next to the window to make the inhabitants of the house only see the inside of the house and the scenes that take place here in between the dwellers and their visitors.

The surrounding landscape not important to Loose and neither was the look of the facade which was to him only a result of the interior.
There is a window in between the bedroom and the living room to be able to see what is happening in the public areas before deciding to enter. The window has a curtain to be able to cut the transparency if needed.

There is a hallway in between the bedrooms and the living rooms. This space is not visible from the common areas and it works as a change to a softer way to go from the most private to the semi private. From this hallway you can also access the bathroom without being seen from the common areas. There is a sink placed here and a mirror above it to enable the possibility for two getting ready in the morning. I believe this could be a great spot for doing hair or make up together before a party.

There is a window in between the bedroom and the living room to make the change in privacy clearer between the private living room and the common area.

The walls to the bedrooms are 200 mm, partly to work as a bearing wall in the construction but also to create a larger distance to the more public areas as well as making the bedroom sound insulated. The concrete is showing in the living room.

The walls are in plywood. Walls are in plywood.

Including shared amount of common space each apartment in my proposal is 31.5 m². A single household apartment that is following the building laws for student apartments today will have a size of 35–38 m². (http://www.boverket.se/Global/Byggs_nförvalta/Dokument/Utforma-studentbostader/bbo-studentbostadsl.pdf)

The windows are placed extreme to the facade to give the facade a thinner impression. A few stories up in the building is the view capturing the city of Göteborg.

The materials in the facade consists of metal sheets with a blue tint, plywood, and glass.
Private and Public

Private and public in the plan and section.
This diagram show the public and private spaces in the building.

The most private.
A space that you don’t have to share with anyone and no one except you reaches, see or hear unless they have an invitation from you. It can be a small space where you should be able to rest and feel safe. No one knows what you do here. This space has no other function except for sleep and rest. In small studios this space is sharing room with other functions as cooking, study and social area. When rest, study, eating, social area are sharing the same room it is difficult to feel neither study desire, appetite or sleep. Inviting visitors into your bedroom area can also feel too private.

Bathroom / WC
The bathroom is private once it is in use. No one should be able to hear and see what you do in here, but when it is vacant you can let other people that you know use it. The room in it self is not private. Not too many people should share the same bathroom. Some functions in the bathroom can be shared openly and create meetings. For example the sink to brush your teeth and wash your face. Before a party you can get ready together by the wash basin and mirror. At parties the queue to the bathroom is usually a nice place to meet new people.

Semi private hall
A hall to pass before entering a more public area in the house. A place from where you can look into the more public space and decide if you want to enter or turn back. This space makes it easier to leave the private area as the change in atmosphere is not so sudden.

Semi public Living room
Semi public living room space where you can invite friends and be social. Still you feel safe and you know who you may encounter. Everyone being here show that they want to socialize to some extent.

Kitchen and dining
A semi private space for cooking, eating and socializing. This is not private and you can share this space with a few people you know. You should feel safe and at home in this area. The kitchen should be shared between maximum 10 - 12 people or the sense of responsibility for the kitchen will disappear (according to the Building and Planning office`s proposal for the design of student housing).

The proposal is a development of the plan of Raketgatan as the living room and kitchen/dining is divided into two different zones of privacy.
Private and Public

How does this plan help the neighbours to get to know each other?

The living room is private and belongs only to the student living in the connecting bedroom, the kitchen on the other hand belongs to all four students. The amount of privacy is slowly decreasing from the very private south facade towards the public north facade. To make the border between private and public in the living room and the kitchen/dining softer, there is no wall in between these two zones. Air, light, sounds and sights are flowing through and make all four students exist in the same atmosphere but still have their own space. If a student is hurt the other students hear her cry and come over with comforting words and hugs. If a student is laughing, the joy might spread to the others. It shouldn't be possible to by accident wander into someone else’s living room. The living room is built upon a stage to mentally and physically create a distinction that there is a change in privacy. To enter a living room requires a determined step up onto the stage.

To ask for help from each other is easier than a regular corridor though you can see if the person in busy and you don’t have to knock on a closed door, and maybe disturb.

The living room also works as a room for representation of who you are and what you like and it makes it easier to get know each other.

Since everyone has their own very private bedroom secluded in the back of their home there is not as much need to protect your living room from other people and it is also easier to tread other’s living room without feeling your invading their privacy.

In this housing I have taken away all the common space except for kitchen and dining area. That way problems like dirty social areas gets eliminated. Instead should people socialize in each other’s living rooms. When being in someone else’s space you are more careful about their things and when it gets dirty there is a person responsible for cleaning. The common areas that do exists are cleaned every week by a hired cleaner.
Private and Public

The common areas are the most public space in the apartments and the most flexible and unplanned. The students can overlook what is happening in this space from their private rooms and choose if they want to participate. Drawings below show a few examples of how the common areas can be used.

The students in this apartment have borrowed dining tables from the other apartments in the building and they are all having a party together.

The floor in the common areas is concrete and it is therefore possible to draw with crayons on. The students are playing hopscotch.

It is close to Christmas and the students have put a Christmas tree in the common areas and are making gingerbread together on two dining tables.
Peter (P)  
Studied economics at the University. He has lectures everyday from 8 am to 4 pm. He never studies at home.

Kenton (K)  
Exchange student from USA. He studies bassoon at the Academy of music and drama. He plays his bassoon at home for one hour a day.

Sana (S)  
Studies architecture at Chalmers. She has lectures from 9 am to 5 pm most days but studies at home during parts of the semester too.

Malin (M)  
She is taking a course in mathematics at the University and has few lectures and studies at home or at the library mostly.

8 am  
S and K gets ready in their bathrooms and K then leaves for school while S is starting to work on a model of a building in her living room when M wakes up.

7.30 am  
P is about to leave for school when K and S is waking up. M is still sleeping. K and S make breakfast together and then they go to sit down in K’s sofa to watch the morning news while eating.

11 am  
S is working on her model. M is studying in her living room. S see in the mirror over the kitchen that M is taking a break and sits in her sofa and play video games on her TV. S also takes a break and comes over and they play together. The cleaner is cleaning all the common areas.

6 pm  
P and K has come home from school. P is watching a movie in his bedroom and K is playing on his bassoon in his room. P is looking out his window towards the dining area and see that S and M are having dinner. He goes out and invite them to a pre-party in his living room this evening.

12.30 pm  
S and M makes lunch and eat together at the dining table.

3 pm  
Everyone has come home. M invite K to sleep together in her bedroom.

9 pm  
S and M are getting ready for P’s party in their bathroom and by the sink in the semi private hall. P is preparing for his party by putting the common dining chairs in his living room and organising a bar on the dining table. S shouts from her apartment asking if he is ready with the preparations so they can come over. Everyone goes over to P and have a great time.
3D modell
Views of two apartments showing room sequences, sight lines and volumes.
Views of two apartments showing room sequences, sight lines and volumes.

Diagonal perspective from the right showing the public common areas, the private living rooms of two apartments and a glimpse of the semi-private hallway leading to the bathroom and bedrooms.
3D modell
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Exterior

The windows have generous dimensions and are placed extreme to the facade which makes the visibility from outside larger. The facade consists of blue tinted metal sheets, plywood and glass. The different materials align with each other and creates the impression of a thin quilted wall rather than a thick solid wall. This makes the border between inside and outside smaller which goes along with the concept of publicity in the common areas inside. The metal sheets are slightly tinted blue to relate to Ulundagatan 39a’s light blue colour and blue shutters.
Exterior

South facade and east facade.

The windows on the south facade are placed deep in the facade to create an impression of that the wall is thick and solid. It creates a border between inside and outside and shows upon the privacy of the space inside. The visibility into the bedrooms is low though there is only one neighbouring house south of the student building and it has no windows on the facade which is facing the building’s south facade (to the very left in picture). Besides the house there is only the student housing’s private garden with tall trees and bushes outside the bedrooms.

The south facade consists of plywood that relates to the surrounding wooden villas. The east facade consists of metal sheets and plywood boarders around the windows. The metal on the facade relates to the metal details on the Olofs Holm’s facade across the street. The metal facade which also continues onto the roof and further onto the west facade creates a greater distance between the south facade and the north facade and accentuates the differences in the two facades.
Exterior View from above. The two new connected buildings I am proposing have similar material and the same angle of the pitched roof as Ullandsgatan 39a. My intention is that the two new buildings together with the old it is attached to should create a unity.
Exterior View from the north of Ulvängsgatan. On the left are the larger lamellas of Olof’s Hög and on the right are the smaller villas with pitched roofs. The student building has similarities with both typologies.
View from the hill to the west side of the building.
During my study trip I did a lot of sketching.

Once I got back home I chose three of the sketches and build models of them.

Model 1
I created this plan because I wanted to eliminate all the unused space that corridors generate. When I broaden the corridor, add sunlight and functions the corridors is transformed in to living room, but still functions for communication too.

The kitchens, entrances, study rooms and dining places belong to groups of six people.

Everyday you will meet the neighbors on your floor when they pass by your living room on their way to or from their apartment. It can be fun and also annoying. If there is a party it can quickly spread along the corridor through all social areas as they are all connected. A negative could be that areas that are supposed to be very private as for outside your bedroom and bathroom where you might want to be able to only wear pajamas or underwear during right, will be passed by neighbors too.

Model 2
All the bedrooms are places on one side of the building and the privacy decreases as you get closer to the other side of the building. Furthest away towards the most public is the hallway. There is no wall in between the hallway and the social areas outside your bedroom only the kitchen furniture which works somewhat to block the view. Apartments of four bedrooms are separated by a flexible wall which you can fold away if you want to connect to apartments when having a part for example.

Every student have their own bedroom with a large opening towards the living room. If you want to be more private you close the opening with a garage door in the ceiling.

The apartments are very social with little area for privacy. If you need to go to the bathroom you have to pass the common areas.

Model 3
A development of the idea from Model 2. There is one private side with bedrooms and it gradually transforms into more public towards the other side.

The corridor is placed diagonally through the apartments in the building to integrate the communication in the room, more like in a regular apartment. A negative of doing that is that neighbours from the other apartments come in some cases very close to the private rooms.

Every student have their own private bedroom and also a more social room connected to the bedroom. The social works as their private living room but it lacks a wall towards the common areas. The idea is that you should be able to be in your room but still oversee what happens in the common room.

One floor in the building includes three larger apartments with four people in each apartment. Every apartment has a separate function like kitchen, study room or living room. All twelve people on the floor go to each other’s apartments to use their functions.

I find it to be a negative that you have to pass the common area to reach the bathroom. Another negative aspect is the level of noise that might occur if everyone wants to watch different shows on the TV in their open living room for example, or when some wants to party while others want to study.
Development no 1
Model 3
A private bathroom with toilet (which is not accessible for wheelchairs) is put in the private bedroom.
The private living room becomes smaller when the private grows larger.
A small stage is created to more clearly show the difference of private and public.

Development no 2
Model 3
Shared bathroom and small private hallway between two neighbours.
A short cut is created to your closest neighbour.
A small stage is created to more clearly show the difference of private and public.
Compartiment forming elements as volumes
Development no 2
Modell 3
The rooms float more freely and the borders of private and public becomes less clear.

Compartiment forming elements as walls
Development no 2
Modell 3
The borders of private and public becomes very clear when a wall is created in between the private living room and the common area. A window is placed in the niche in the living room to get a better view towards the common area.
For a long time during my process the building was one single lamella and the roof was flat but tilted in a rather large angle. The reason was to connect to the lamellas of Olofs Höjd that look similar. During this time in my process the building was connected to the villa, Utlandagatan 39a. The size, volume and material (glass facade) of the student building almost gives an impression of overpowering the villa. I tried separating the lamella from the villa to get around the feeling of overpowering and also to get more light into the apartments that are blocked from light by the villa. The largest amount of distance possible due to other buildings would be four meters. A space that is four meters wide, 11 meters height on one side, 15 meters on the other side and rather long might be an odd and dark space. I put exterior corridors to fill the space and make something happen in the gap between the buildings but would give interior less light.
In this proposal for a student housing the goal is to make the students want to live together rather than in single household apartment. The reason for this goal is to reduce the risk for the students to feel lonely. I believe that the collective student housing that exist today are not social, instead the common areas rather create discomfort than wellbeing and community. I want to find a solution where the student housing becomes social and create a feeling of safety for the student.

I researched how student housing was planned abroad to get inspiration. Unfortunately I found the situation to be similar there. I investigated what could maybe create the problems of discomfort by taking a closer look at how the rooms and functions where placed in the buildings. I discovered that the problems often occurred when the social and the private areas were too separated and when the private areas had little or no contact (visual och hearing) with the more social areas.

To create a more social dwelling there is a greater need for contact between the private and the social areas and also different bridging zones in between. Bridging zones are places where you can feel safe of being in your private /semi private sphere and at the same time be a part of the social. It would make it easier to participate in events with others.

I have in my proposal made a plan where four people share kitchen. The private living room become a bridging zone in between the private and public where you are in your private sphere but at the same time in a social environment where you have access to others.

Problems / Development of the idea
This way of living is transparent and social with little space for privacy. For this reason it is probably not the right dwelling for everyone. It requires a desire of being social though there is in addition to all the positive meetings also a great risk of annoyance when neighbours being too loud in their livingroom space for example.

This proposal is an extreme version of an idea that could easily be made more private by enlarging the bedroom and shrinking the living room. If the living room needed more space at times it could maybe instead grow into the common area.

In the work of my master thesis I have gathered a greater understanding how the way plans have large importance how people act and feel and that it is important to consider this when building new.