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Preface

Architecture plays a significant role in reintegrating convicts into society. The halfway house exists as a quasi-sub-institution, but there is very little in the way of architecture that specifically addresses the role of the halfway house as a mediator between imprisonment and freedom. This thesis will address the most critical lenses through which the work can be discussed, and then focus on an overview of the project and process, followed by some of the important details that were investigated.

Why bother? In the US, we seem to have trouble keeping people out of prison. (Figure 1) Americans also have a distorted definition of a convict, where a convict is either a violent man locked up in Gitmo or a celebrity cashing in on notoriety like Martha Stewart. In reality, most men who come out of prison are neither celebrities on a pedestal nor people who should be feared and locked into seclusion. He is somewhere between the two, an ordinary guy with a LOT of bad breaks.

A halfway house exists between these two conditions, prison and freedom. That is an architecturally significant idea, being between something, what is often called interstitial space or what Peter Eisenman refers to as blurring. For example, graffiti was the genesis of this thesis, and it is the ephemeral nature of marks on a wall, and the transient nature of the act, that become the most architecturally suggestive ideas.
What brought graffiti, it’s architectural position, and its relationship to the penal system was the illicit act of making marks on a wall, and the inevitable social and political consequences. The wall becomes a canvas for feelings and opinions, an existence between clarity and chaos. The wall is a surface in a consistently ambiguous state that possesses a meaning both of support and containment AND an imageable surface that exists between order and disorder. So we arrive at a wall that is constantly between states. We could also examine the threshold of a typical doorway and perceive a clear linear boundary (Figure 47), but when we play with that boundary we arrive at spaces which possess other meanings than for example “inside” or “outside,” but both inside and outside AND something else.

Reintegration also exists somewhere between. It is a contemporary name given to the function of a halfway house, not to rehabilitate a convict but to integrate him back into society. It is a component of our prison system meant to provide transition beyond incarceration before the state is satisfied that the convict has been punished. Convicts are offered early release in exchange for a modicum of freedom. These men, then, are between conditions as wards of the system.

Reintegration, then, is the act of taking a man who has spent most of his life living within poor moral circles with a family of negative influences, and exposing him to the right way to operate within society. It is often overlooked and is dealt with in the shadows. This is something that people don’t want in their neighborhoods, something that nobody wants next to an elementary school, something that is trying to either
hide itself or is being ostracized as most of the people in this system have been throughout their lives. This is, effectively, taking our trash and dumping into a hidden landfill, and the public can no longer perceive nor understand the inherent problems and challenges in returning a man to society. There is the opportunity, then, for the halfway house to become a condition where society is also exposed to the convict. So the question is: what is the image of this place? Hidden and concealed, iconic and outgoing, or somewhere in between?

What I have learned is that the architecture must introduce multiple ambiguities, an environment for the convict and the public to interact in a place where both are comfortable and aware. This building is sited along an interstitial site between highway on ramps and off ramps, the edges of historic city fabric, the edge of the historic waterfront. This architecture is a new institution that seeks to simultaneously embrace and protect these men as they transition through a critical point in their lives, where site selection is defined by the idea of the between space.

Located in Washington, DC, between the neighborhoods of Foggy Bottom and Georgetown, the site has been cut away from the urban fabric into a residual condition. This becomes an opportunity to reintegrate the site back into the city. The building invites the convict within its walls by drawing him down a muse, between converted townhouses and past an art gallery. The entire lower level, in fact, is a condition between the de facto halfway house and the street, with two teaching facilities that are fronted as a restaurant and custom bicycle manufacturing, along
with the gallery and other retail enterprises.

The convict ascends into a place where he sheds the label of 'convict' and becomes, for a time, occupant.' He will encounter the eastern wall, a threshold between the city and the halfway house that hugs in a protective gesture. Significance is given to the refectory, a place for men to communally break bread with each other. He will also encounter, through all movements throughout the building, a raised cloister that is fully removed from the burdens of the world. The building, then, acts as the space between public and private, and the physical and psychological aspects of exposure and shelter.
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“In an “information age” it is too easy to lose sight of the fact that what something is, is distinct from what it communicates. Joining the pervasive suppression of the perception of reality in favor of the perception of messages—of what is in favor of what is meant—will loosen us ever further from the possibility of an architecture grounded in fact and a sense of the necessary.”

Michael Benedikt, *For an Architecture of Reality*
Chapter 1: Developing New Patterns

This chapter introduces the program of the halfway house as a means of limiting recidivism in America’s prisons. The history of prisons is beyond the scope of this paper, but there will be a brief discussion of the history of the halfway house and community corrects. This is followed by discussions of halfway house, group home, and other alternative means of rehabilitation. The goal of this chapter is to provide insight into the spaces, uses, and connections of human rehabilitation for further development into a new type of program modeled after the modern halfway house.

History

Between the 16th and 18th centuries halfway houses were used in England and Ireland for the reformation of minor offenders. In 1841 a bootmaker named John Augustus took responsibility for a convicted drunkard. He rehabilitated the man to the satisfaction of the courts prior to his sentencing. (Sieh 1993) The courts later ruled that convicted drunkards could be granted probation despite the protests of state-supported jailers. The United States began establishing shelters for ex-offenders in Philadelphia in 1889, and later spread to other states, and “by the mid-20th century, halfway houses were again viewed by the public and policymakers alike as a viable tool in the correctional arsenal.” (Carmen Gutierrez) With ever-larger prison populations, by the 1960’s re-integration of prisoners back into society became a primary goal. Unfortunately, positive results were offset by such measures as the 1975 Safe Streets act, as well as public support for getting tough on crime, resulting
in longer prison sentences and an increase in recidivism.

The original halfway house was thought to be a traveler’s stop. The modern definition of a halfway house, often called a “Community corrections” facility, can encompass, in separate treatment facilities with different methodologies, mental treatment, substance abuse treatment, homeless reintegration, juvenile incarceration, safe houses for troubled women, varying levels of incarceration rehabilitation, and elderly care.

In the manifestation of offender rehabilitation, halfway houses are used to alleviate crowded prisons, but also accommodate other non-incarcerate sentences. They may also be used as an alternative to probation or parole revocation. According to Edward Sieh, the modern probation model of rehabilitation has drawn criticism, leading to the latest models of rehabilitation that include the Reintegration Model, the Radical Nonintervention Model, and the Justice Model. (Sieh 2006) The Reintegration Model focuses on the family, employment, and education as a means of reintegrating the offender back into the community. The Radical Nonintervention model focuses on the victim in a limiting approach to rehabilitation. The Justice Model emphasizes supervision and “punishment proportionate to the offense.” Whatever the model used, modern probation has shown that community involvement and programs of assistance and education are critical for reintegration of the inmate into the community.
Image of the convict today

The United States has developed a problem that is growing larger every year. The general purpose of institutional incarceration of criminals is for both punishment and rehabilitation—in theory if you commit a crime you spend a commensurate period of time locked up. This should to be a deterrent to criminals against future crimes, but in fact:

- In 2000 there were 652,000 adult offenders on parole
- 630,000 offenders are released from prison every year
- More than 50% of offenders return to prison within three years of release

(Figure 1)
- Juveniles comprise 16% of violent crime arrests and 32% of property crime arrests in 1999.
- 100,000 juveniles are released from detention facilities every year.
- Application of risk principle reform requires matching levels of intensity of reform with risk levels of offenders. *(Learn About Reentry.)*

![Figure 2: Domestic versus Supervised Population.* By author. Source: *Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS).* Apr. 1995](image)

The institution of the halfway house, a place between internment and freedom, is successful in reducing recidivism but its clients are viewed with fear and distaste by society. Also called ‘community corrections’ facilities, they are rarely purpose-built, often deposited in low-value environments among residential populations with the lowest political power or awareness. These places of transitional internment are
hidden away much in the same manner as our waste. When compared to China, the US has a much higher proportion of its population under institutional supervision (Figure 2). Pulling our prison system back into the public gaze will help shed light on the problems that modern incarceration has created in our society.

Halfway houses are often drab reconstituted residences chosen specifically to hide or mask their purpose. NIMBYs encourage a bias against ex-convicts, despite these men having served a full prison sentence. In order to assist ex-convicts' admittance back into society, a space designed specifically for the purpose of healing and reintegration would decrease recidivism while providing society with productive and mentally healthy members. H.R. 1529, The Second Chance for Ex-Offenders Act of 2009 provides legislation and funding for released inmates who have committed nonviolent criminal offenses, in an attempt to reduce recidivism.

Image does not only apply to the physically manifestation of a building, it also relates to the image of the offender. In the American penal system a criminal who is not considered a minor will carry his sentence for the rest of his life regardless of the term he is required to spend behind bars. There is a bias against hiring convicts, especially for jobs with any significant public profile. While in many cases this is understandable—who wants a convicted pedophile teaching children?—it also restricts the opportunities for a reformed criminal to turn around and make a positive contribution to society.
**Group Homes**

Convicts are often men who have spent their lives in trouble. In Washington, DC the average prisoner is male, with a median age of 32, black, with no completed primary education. One in four was incarcerated due to a violent or dangerous offense (*Facts and Figures, June 2010*). On the other hand, Federal prisoners spent on average 43 months in prison, typically half of the sentence served. These men spend these four years living in a cell, usually with a second inmate, measuring 48 square feet, or roughly 1/6 the size of the bedroom of le Corbusier’s Unite d’Habitation.

The firm Architecture-Research-Construction (ARC) discusses the idea of the group home living model as advantageous to the institutional living model in “Community Group Homes.” The primary notion is that the institution, as a necessity are arranged to engage in control (Hospitals, prisons), they are not conducive to environmental integration and promote conformity. This conflicts with the idea of a halfway house as a place of reintegration. Individuality is culturally important to the United States, so a halfway should provide a transition from group thinking to free thinking (*Figure 3*).

The institution necessarily restricts individuality and requires conformity in order to support its operations. Hospitals require patients to listen to their doctors in order to get better, and prisons require inmates to listen to guards in order to minimize incidents between inmates. The institution, according to ARC, does not provide supportive places. “It relegates inmates to the passive role of service consumers
rather than enabling them to become empowered, responsible participants.” Group homes, however, offer a place for residents to more smoothly re-integrate with society.
Based on ARC’s surveys of men in group homes, the social interactions of a person undergoing recovery go much further when each person has private spaces that make them feel safe and comfortable. Improved social interactions help residents participate better, and “… the people who had participated in decision-making… spent more time awake, more time out of their bedrooms, and more time closer to others.” (Architecture-Research-Construction) Arrangement of spaces is also critical to recovery. ARC has found that arrangements of rooms improve rehabilitation. For example, a double-loaded corridor of a long string of rooms, similar to a dormitory, leads to fewer interactions between students. (Fig. 2x) However, arrangements of small numbers of rooms en suite increase interactions between residents. Following are two models of group home programs with an aim to rehabilitate, Helsingør Psychiatric Hospital and the Oxford House.

**Oxford House**

Washington DC’s first self-run recovery house, the first Oxford House opened in October 1975 when a state-run halfway house closed due to lack of funds. The original residents decided to rent the original state-run house, running it like a college fraternity. Paul Molloy writes that members would be vetted by existing members, and the house would operate democratically and without any outside staff. Begun as a non-profit organization, profits are used to open new houses, augmented by funds from the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (Molloy, United States. Alcohol, and Oxford House). By 1989 there were 35 self-run self-supported houses in the DC metro and
Pennsylvania areas.

Most members come from shattered homes and require transitional help. The houses are comprised of men and women, but segregated within the same building or into different buildings. Many members are able to stay sober despite past failures in other programs. Members can stay as long as necessary or desired, but any member will be expelled due to alcohol or drug use, or non-payment of rent. “Responsibility is learned or re-learned.” (Molloy, United States. Alcohol, and Oxford House 1991)

Members pay dues to Oxford House Inc. in exchange for a house charter and support. Houses should not be located in slums—fear of safety or living conditions does not encourage recovery. Molloy writes, “Experience has shown that by living in a good house in a good neighborhood, all individuals, whether from poor, middle class or wealthy neighborhoods, value their living accommodations and have an additional incentive to stay clean and sober.” Zoning should be residential, in order to consider all residents as equally as non-addicts. Stable environments are absolutely necessary—leases should be renewed whenever possible. Jim S. was the very first Oxford House member, and after graduating lived twelve years sober before dying in 1987.

Houses should consist of at least four bedrooms, many of which should accommodate two people. This ratio of people per rooms agrees with ARC findings. “Isolation and loneliness are threats to sobriety….” (Self-run…) Physical qualities require a
location in a good neighborhood, adequately sized for a “family”, adequate facilities, and close proximity to public transportation. Twin-size beds are best, with a minimum of two people per bedroom. Extra refrigerator space in the kitchen is a necessity.

An Oxford house runs on the principle of self-help, and a house must operate from rent receipts alone. House officers are democratically elected for six-month terms for positions of President, Treasurer, Comptroller, and Secretary. Voting is used to determine issues that cannot be agreed upon.

_Helsingør Psychiatric Hospital_

Bjarke Ingels Group (BIG) was awarded, in 2002, a design competition for a psychiatric hospital. BIG’s design needed to balance paradoxical and contradictory factors: Open and Sheltered, Centralized and Decentralized, Freedom and Control, and Private and Public. The constraints were set by the hospital in an effort to operate like a traditional institution—rationally and efficiently—but giving it an intimate and home-like sense of place. (Ingels, Group, and Dansk)

The hospital staff desired a place of safety with privacy and seclusion for the patients, but a maximum of social interaction. The solution was to arrange a large number of communal spaces with a maximum of freedom, but at the same time giving the hospital control over which patients were allowed to be where and when. The core
idea is a place for both freedom and therapy.

*Institutional Reintegration*

The District of Columbia has adopted a limited reintegration model for dealing with recidivism. (Murphy 05 Nov. 2010) Private firms are contracted to the city to provide housing and programs on a per-case basis for their clients based upon sentencing or release agreements, managed by the District’s Community Corrections program.

An inmate who has been qualified for release to the Community Corrections center is given an orientation period of 3-7 days. This allows him to meet his case officer and program staff, but primarily to adjust to the new environment. After the orientation period each client follows a tailored schedule of job interviews and programs, along with weekend passes and other modes of temporary freedom, but all movements are tracked by the Center. For instance, on a job interview the inmate is required to check out of the building by his case officer. Since clients are not permitted the use of cars, he must take public transportation to his interview. The interviewee must call in to the center upon both arrival and departure of the inmate, and penalties exist for procedural violations.

The creation of a Community Center involves substantial input from the community on the existence of a center and its mission; thus, the community determines to some extent who is allowed to live in the Center. Early experiments used reclaimed
industrial buildings to house hundreds of men in a single-node configuration, where services and access revolved around a single control point. This came to be problematic, as the control point was tasked with processing each man at least twice in a day; for a population of 250 this meant a minimum of 500 processes.

The District has learned from its accumulated data regarding community corrections, and the ideal modern configuration replies on a distributed-node scheme. There is no limit to the total population under one roof, but the population must be broken into 40-person nodes, where each node contains its own control point. Some programs are limited to single-node operations, like kitchens and bathrooms, but others like counseling and education can be shared among nodes. (Murphy)

*Live/Work/Play*

If the halfway house is a threshold between places, the program should then express this intermediacy: moving away from prison and toward home, but at the same time being neither one. The home should therefore play the role of suggestive reminder for the client as a goal to work toward. It is easy to suggest a home-like, comfortable environment out of empathy for the plight of the modern prisoner, but if the goal is *transition* then the environment should be pleasant, certainly, but not a place for permanent habitation.

A model for a place of transition can still be inspired by the home. Nancy Solomon,
Hazel Conway, and Will Alsop among others have discussed the idea of spaces in the home considered not as “bedroom” or “living room,” but frame the idea of spaces in the home as Live, Work, and Play. Describing a space using broader adjectives over specific nouns helps dispose of preconceived biases. We might know what a playground should look like, for instance, but have more difficulty agreeing on what a play space might be. This is important when examining a new type of program in order for a halfway house to be understood as a specific place and not be confused with “factory,” “home,” or “bakery.”

Framing the functions of the halfway house using Live, Work, and Play might then create a place that is home-like without being oriented toward permanent habitation. We might then expand how we view these spaces in order to determine where, specifically, someone might sleep at night. The functions of Live include resting, eating, bathing, and rehabilitating. Play might be comprised of exercising, relaxing, and socializing. Work then lends itself to reintegrating, learning, teaching, and making/doing. Organizing this further into spaces that lend themselves (or not) to privacy gives us the following chart:
ORGANIZATION METHODS

Figure 4: "Organization Methods." By Author.
The modern halfway house camouflages itself into the urban fabric. An unwanted space is contorted into a place for reintegration, often by occupying an existing known building without upsetting the exterior envelope. The place, to the common passerby, does not appear to change, and the community is unaware of the transition from factory or low-value residence to a concentration of semi-rehabilitated convicts being reintegrated back into the community.

*Between*

The inmate operates within many layers of transition. The halfway house itself is a transitional point between incarceration and freedom. He has completed a prison sentence dictated by society as sufficient punishment for his crime, but he will always carry the administrative designation of a convicted criminal. If he is a drug/alcohol abuser, the halfway house is the place he will find recovery and rehabilitation programs. He lives between conditions of jobless/employed, must transition from a set of friends made in prison back to his family, and the ideal condition for both the city and the inmate is one of camouflage. The city doesn’t want to disturb the work and money put into the creation and maintenance of a community corrections center. The less people know about the space the better. The inmates don’t want to stand out in society; for those who have managed to turn themselves around, they simply want to fit in and get another chance.

*So What?*

Programmatic research points to a few consistent details for ideal rehabilitation environments. The environment should be transitional, both physically and
intellectually. Arrangements of spaces should encourage small-group interaction, with as many opportunities for these interactions as possible. Look for opportunities to open up spaces that often become private despite their purpose, such as a dead-end kitchen.

Residents should never live alone; while the ideal number of roommates is two, this contradicts with the ‘never alone’ concept as an odd number of inmates will always result in one member living by himself. In a limited footprint condition the ideal number of beds per room is three: once a critical mass of four residents is reached, rooms can always be shuffled so there are always two or three men per room.

Private spaces should be provided for personal use, but flexible scheduling can be used to accommodate lower budget environments. Ample kitchen space is important in dense environments. Exposure to the public is important, but equally important is a place of safety and security that the residents can return to. Halfway houses should be located in good neighborhoods adjacent to transportation, jobs, and services.
Chapter 2: Context

This thesis is in part a proposition for a new type of architecture. Therefore, the primary consideration is not site-specific but relationship-specific: a program that can maintain relative associations and theoretical stipulations that can be applied to any new place with the same results. There are particular practical and social needs that limit the placement of a concentration of convicts. Then there are societal biases that further limit potential site locations. Finally, there are my own personal biases of what “good architecture” means that restrict the site of this project. This chapter intends to address these issues, along with an introduction to several sites distilled from preliminary site research.

Regional

First and foremost is the larger picture, addressing how a halfway house fits within society. Ideally the best place for a reformed criminal to live is within the same city, even the same neighborhood, where he caused the most damage. From an ideological point of view it makes sense for a reformed convict to include as part of his rehabilitation the work required for a person to contribute to their community: act as eyes on the street, participate in social programs, help neighbors in need of assistance, and so on. This becomes an opportunity to transition a liability to an asset. The potential for a return to a life of crime by geographic association can be balanced by a strong community rehabilitation program that offers support and a positive social environment which can act as a new foundation for a reformed life.
Modern trends in biological and economic sustainability indicate that the density of the urban environment is a greater asset for continued development of the built environment than rural and sometimes even suburban locales in instances of sprawl. Services can be more easily distributed among large concentrations of people, public transportation becomes more effective, the average city dweller occupies a much smaller physical footprint than his country cousin, and the list goes on. One drawback to a dense urban environment is a higher relative proportion of violent crimes. Common sense dictates then that the best programs for reducing crime should be located in the same areas with the largest crime problems.

Washington DC is not only the nation’s capital but also has a dense urban core and statistically one of the nation’s worst incidents of violent crime. DC as of 2009 has the 16th crime ranking in the United States (City Crime Rate Rankings (High to Low)), with the 27th largest population (Top 50 Cities in the U.S. by Population and Rank). Since it is often easier to test new concepts on smaller populations prior to implementation on a larger scale, this makes Washington DC an ideal region to study. DC’s position as the political capital of the world makes a substantial investment in local corrections infrastructure a public comment on the inability of the federal prison system to cut down on crime.
Local

The ideal environment for convict rehabilitation is one that gradually transitions men from the rigor and stability of the prison environment to the instability of open freedom. The Department of Justice outlines three basic phases of reentry:

**Phase 1** – Protect and Prepare: Institution-Based Programs

**Phase 2** – Control and Restore: Community-Based Transition Programs

**Phase 3** – Sustain and Support: Community-Based Long-Term Support Programs

*(Learn About Reentry.)*

The ideal transitional internal environment, then, is sited in an equally transitional but stable neighborhood and the best example of this is the mixed-use neighborhood. Layers of residential, institutional, commercial, and retail offer a multitude of work, food, and entertainment opportunities. Maintaining essential services within walking distance is critical, as many convicts are going to have difficulty arranging motorized transportation with a limited budget. Adjacency to public transportation is also important. Ideally, public transportation and grocery stores should be located no more than 15-30 minutes walking distance from home. This makes the ideal location for most services to within 2000 to 3000 feet of the halfway house. Providing educational opportunities for inmates is also important, but if they are accessible via public transportation then the distance to an education facility like a community college can be within the metropolitan city.
If you accept that a rehabilitated convict no longer poses a threat to society, parents should have no problem with their kids going to school next to a halfway house. Common sense argues, however, that the average parent would never approve of such a potentially symbiotic relationship. In absence of federal or local regulations

Figure 5: "Site Location by School Distribution 1." By author.
dictating the placement of a halfway house, borrowing the rule of housing convicted pedophiles no closer than 1000 feet to a school, a diagram of no-build zones of Washington, DC is generated. *Figure 5, Figure 6.*

![Site Location by School Distribution](image)

**Biases**

Twenty-four sites were given a cursory examination based upon the no-build map, where spaces were examined for ‘buildability;’ that is, open spaces without an apparent use, or sites supporting a significantly deteriorated building (*Figure 7*). Residual sites — places not ordinarily considered habitable but which nonetheless may support the space, connectivity, and infrastructure to support a building—were also considered. Residual sites included oversize medians, unused public parks, alleys, and the land left over from highway interchanges. Often called brownfield
land, these sites often require significant expense to remediate site contamination from prior site uses such as industrial or commercial facilities that deposited hazardous material in the soil.

Brownfield sites are expensive and difficult to make habitable, but their use is considered important to the modern ecology movement. If development, which is economically important, can take place without disturbing “untouched” land, which is ecologically important, mankind’s use of the planet then becomes a symbiotic, not parasitic, relationship. A second bias, then, is that the site selection incorporates the promotion of good ecological practices.
Figure 8: "Pragmatic site characteristics." By author.
Modern design practices take the things we find unsavory and hide them. Heavy industry is moved out of the cities, trash is dumped hundreds of miles from its depositors, and city-sized supermax prisons are located in sequestered rural areas. The practice of concealing “bad” aspects of life enforces an “out of sight, out of mind” mentality. A contemporary take on these issues is to create awareness instead of concealment; if society is allowed to see its own problems it is more likely to do something about it. If everyone woke up in the morning with a view of a garbage dump, we would be more likely to cut down on our waste. If our prison systems are overcrowded, then by this line of logic it makes sense to pull our prisons back into the public eye. If we went even further out on a limb and suggested that the wealthiest portion of society is perhaps more capable of aiding the poorest portion of society while the blindest to its problems, then a halfway house does not belong in a lower-class neighborhood but in fact a wealthy one. Below are non-critical biases considered for site selection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eccentric geometry a plus</th>
<th>Residual or brownfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for public space</td>
<td>Urban environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither dominates nor camouflages.</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural views (internal or external)</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help strengthen urban edge</td>
<td>Maximize square footage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric geometry a plus</td>
<td>Help strengthen urban edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for adaptive reuse</td>
<td>Mixed-use site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: "Site selection biases." By author.
Figure 10: "Site F." By author.

Figure 11: "Site O." By author.
Three Sites

The top three sites favored all or parts of these limiting biases. The first, Site O (Figure 11), is located one block south of the U Street corridor. The site is primarily residential, and borrows portions of alley, access, and adjacent buildings to incorporate a program. Site O has the possibility of incorporating residual spaces and eccentric geometries, and any work here would certainly have the opportunity to maintain a strong urban edge. While the U Street corridor is certainly up-and-coming, or at the very least not derelict, it does not meet the upper-class neighborhood criteria, and does not possess natural views. The site is also primarily residential, where an optimal solution would entail a mix of uses in the immediate area. The second site, Site F (Figure 10), is a south-facing site one block north of Washington Circle on I St between 23rd and 24th streets. The police station on the southeast corner is barely standing and does not contribute to the neighborhood, and in fact the city is planning to demolish both the police station and adjacent library as part of an urban renewal project. While the site, at up to 45,000 square feet, is the largest, its adjacency to the library is troublesome and, at best, the library might need to be reconsidered on another site. For the people of DC this is a difficult proposal as the library system is currently considered too small and mismanaged, so removing city resources would not be wise. Otherwise the site meets a number of other criteria save “eccentric geometries” as the site is generally rectangular.
The last site, Site X (*Figure 12, Figure 13*), is located at a confluence of two highways and two roads, and adjacent to two other primary roads (*Figure 16*). Just south of K St and immediately east of 27th St, this Foggy Bottom location is the remnant of the convergence of Interstate 66 and the Whitehurst freeway, and marks the terminus of Virginia Avenue. The Rock Creek Parkway skirts the site to the West. Sharing the site are three two-story townhouses, and directly south of the site is the service entrance side of Georgetown University’s Hall on Virginia Ave residence building. Immediately west of the site is a semi-concealed unmarked circular building on government park land; minimal upkeep and complete lack of glazing suggest the typology of a service building. Diagonally southwest of the site is the Thompson Boat Center. Further south on the other side of the Georgetown residence is the Watergate Hotel complex, and immediately south of that is the

![Figure 12: "Site X Overview 1." By author.](image)
Kennedy Performing Arts Center. Adjoining the site to the north is the Rock Creek Park, and to the west are Georgetown and the historic C&O canal.

A number of criteria make this site the optimal location for the program. 22,000 square feet appears to be ample for the program, it overlooks a small yet untended park, and a building of sufficient height would have views of the water. The complex and unusual geometry is formed by the imposition of a federal highway into both the city grid and on top of a scenic parkway. The land, sloping toward the Potomac River to the south, is further raised as a berm to support the Whitehurst Freeway.

While the three buildings are not detracting, there are also no markings indicating

Figure 13: "Site X." By author.
historic status. Their zone-limited height appear to come from the older 1800’s grid where I St, comprised of a number of 2-story row homes, had likely continued through prior to the addition of Route 66, but there is no longer physical or visual continuity. This zoning is not consistent with the remaining neighborhood of buildings seven to eleven stories tall. As mentioned before, an elevated building may have views of the water, though this would also engage views back to the building.

Video footage was used to engage site analysis, where real-time footage offered experiential representation of site conditions. Still footage (i.e. when the camera did not move), was collaged to represent movement of the world around the site (Figure

Figure 14: "_S2 Analysis.mov" By author. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G1HpEnvnVR4
In footage where the camera was moving, high-speed “scrubbing” (indexing along the length of the movie) compressed the experiences as a means of seeking experiential patterns. Diagrams layered onto the footage reveal the frames perceived by the driver. Driving-based footage along Rock Creek Parkway, Virginia Ave, K St, and the Whitehurst Freeway were augmented by collaged non-moving footage of a number of vantage points adjacent to the site. One critical factor to note is the exposure of the site from nearly every highway or road. All of these views are high speed, and with two exceptions all of these moving vantage points are tangential or oblique to the site.

A drive along Rock Creek Parkway heading south offers very soft edges to the roadway but a definite sense of enclosure regardless. When arriving tangentially to the site, the openness of the interchange is mitigated by the horizontal surfaces of the numerous overpasses and the vertical surfaces of the highway support system. The west face of the site is visible across the non-park to the driver of this route.
A drive along K St heading east, (*Figure 15*) provides a sense of enclosure is felt along the entire route until arriving at the open space of the Rock Creek Parkway, but with few of the redeeming factors of the scenic road. This road is not adjacent to the site but a view south provides a long-distance view of the north edge before the driver returns to the wide-tall surfaces of K St. Multiple shifts in vertical and horizontal surfaces were perceived due to the variation in building placement and the bridges encountered along the way.

*Figure 15: "_D1_Analysis" Movie by author.  http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7tKsi-8EID8*
Driving north on Interstate 66 the southern convergence point of the site is met slightly off-axis. Video D5 suggests this view, while the remainder of the drive engages the broadest views with the least sense of enclosure. This is likely to be the highest-speed approach along the site at upward of 50 miles per hour.

Driving south on the elevated Whitehurst Freeway E St exit ramp, footage from Video D4 suggests that a building elevated at or above the level of the roadway would bring that building into the line of sight. Any project that engages the convergence point will be readily viewed by this driver nearly on-axis.

While the site may only be partially revealed to a driver coming north along Virginia Ave, from Video D2 it is likely both the Watergate Hotel and the site will be visible
at the same time. The primary vertical surface along Virginia is saw-toothed, as this is a diagonal road and nearly every building presents itself on the oblique.

History

The sequence of events that led up to the unusual shape of this site unfolded over the course of two hundred years. Prior to the plan of DC drawn by Pierre L’Enfant, the neighborhood of Georgetown came into being as an important shipping site along the Potomac. In 1791 L’Enfant was commissioned by George Washington to draw up a plan for the new capital city of America. After the plan was put into action, a canal system that began at the Mall and led to the Watergate, and eventually to the C&O canal, created a new edge to the shoreline. The C&O/Mall connection was severed and that portion of the canal was filled in, further extending the shoreline into the Potomac. At this point, along the north end of the site, the K Street bridge had already been built. In the 1920’s the Rock Creek Parkway was cut into the landscape along the river’s edge, followed shortly thereafter by the closure of the C&O canal to shipping traffic. The bypass route called the Whitehurst Freeway cut along the north end of the site, and this was later revised to become a freeway and exit into Route 50/66. The Route 50/66 interchange became the termination point for a freeway project through DC that was protested by DC residents, which cut significantly into the original L’Enfant grid. Lastly came the Watergate Hotel which, while not specifically impacting the site, cut across a large number of blocks and fronted the diagonally aligned Virginia Ave.
Figure 18: “Historic diagram of DC's street grid.” By author.

Figure 17a-19h: "History of Site." By author.
**Chapter 3: Form**

*Between*

The threshold is understood as a clear architectural line that defines “here” versus “there. In order to interrupt perception of the threshold, the incidents that occur on either side of the threshold should be made decidedly unclear, where the two spaces are both separate and unified. The line between is blurred. Blurring is, according to Eisenman, a return to the relationship between body and architecture. If blurring is a means of affecting over effecting the body, it purports to fulfill the need for things which are “real, tangible, secure, and comfortable.” (Benjamin 2003) Blurring is described using transitional terminology in his essay “Processes of the Interstitial.” Superposition, blurring, between… the conceptual operation is not exclusively a black/white forest/tree condition, but somewhere in a realm between the two.

*Frame*

Catherine Ingraham refers to issues of frame in her essay “Lines and Linearity,” where a series of images of a drawing of a Paris city map demonstrates a multiplicity of frames within which the lines of the maps are viewed along a variety of scales, the final image seeming more like a rendered landscape than ink under a microscope.

“The frame of a painting, airplane window, camera lens, printed margin, and also the frames of political and cultural forces, are all equally governing.” (Kahn 1991) The frame is drawn with a line, explicitly or implicitly, creating a rule to guide perception.
An open composition, when considering art, deliberately disturbs a complete understanding of the whole, requiring imagination to complete the picture, and disturbs the viewer’s understanding of space in a way that requires thought and investigation, and therefore interest. It is the line that deliberately touches the frame and suggests that the image is incomplete.

The line, then, is an element that is wholly, partially, or not captured within the frame. The last two exist beyond the perceivable picture plane, and we are meant to assume the existence of that other space without the ability to see it. Mies van der Rohe’s sketches and photographs of the Barcelona Pavilion were cropped so that the lines and planes comprising edges and spaces could be understood to continue outside the frame of the picture. Ingraham transitions from the line as framing element to the architectural wall as a line in space. The wall is framed by the floor, ceiling, other walls, or the space beyond the wall. The wall is a barrier between the spaces on either side, as much as a line drawn on the floor is a clear delineation between here and there. Therefore, if architecture is to achieve a sense of space beyond the frame of perception, the line, the wall, the barrier must be broken.

**Transformation**

The architectural process as transformation of a derivative work can take many forms. The more familiar and perhaps less subjective version is the transformation of a recognized work into a new work that can be traced back to the original. Collin Rowe demonstrates Le Corbusier’s transformation of Villa Savoye, taking principals
of organization, proportion, and shafts of space and adapting them to new technologies that allow the existence of the free plan. (Rowe 1976) Bernard Tschumi takes another approach in Manhattan Transcripts, using 24 photographed instances of a murder as the basis for architectural plans, and diagrams as interpretations of the plans. The photographs progress linearly as a sequence of events, each plan is developed from both the photograph and the plan preceding it, and the diagram is a similar development of the plan and the diagram before. The above process is labeled “MT1,” MT2-4 use alternative methods of a layered sequential iterative process favoring either temporality, logic, or some mode between the two. The architecture relates to and is formed by space, time, events, and actions.

Figure 19: "Base animation." Animation by author. TagBaseAnimation_1.mov. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G0RqKwXsqxM
Borrowing from Tschumi’s approach, a digital spatial construct of a word was crafted and used distortion tools to manipulate the word into an architectural space (*Figure 19*). The goal was to craft a graffiti-like “tag” that is much like traditional spray-paint-on-wall tags, in that Grecco-latin script is clearly evident though difficult to read without guidance, but differs in that it can only be “read” by registering multiple points of view across time. An animation of this space was crafted, and then the video was cropped to improve the compositional sequence. The video, now removed from the model, was edited in multiple manners to achieve new video sequences.

These manipulations were borrowed from themes of time proposed by Alan Lightman’s essays in “Einstein’s Dreams.” In one instance, time occurs at a normal rate except when approaching town. Time slows down the closer a visitor gets to the center, while also speeding up the further one travels from that same point. This was manifested, for instance, in video by playing one video at a normal rate of time, and layering a second video that mimics a distortion of time by slowing down halfway through and speeding up for the remainder (*Figure 20*). Other manipulations included: de-sequenced layers of the same clip offset by fractions of time; multiple sets of de-sequenced videos or layers of layers; alternative display modes layered on top of the original sequence; and a sequence played forward and reverse simultaneously.

These videos were subjected to a frame-by-frame analysis seeking content, composition, and beauty in the image (*Figure 21*). The images were then cropped,
rotated, and edited, and became the basis for diagrammatic analysis. The first series examines the lines in the image, tracing specific lines of force then blending these lines into a single topographic composition. The second series are a set of models that interpret the two-dimensional image into a three-dimensional construct (*Figure 22*). The third series uses bas-relief techniques as an alternative spatial technique to realize the layers of information in the image.
Figure 21: "Animation Sequence Diagram." By author.
Figure 22: "Model || Curl." By author.
Precedents in art:

Works of art can suggest visual and intellectual paths to direct architectural exploration. Graffiti was the genesis of this thesis, and as a work of art it is as influential in America as any established work, artist, or period. The four periods of art investigated include Impressionism, Expressionism, Cubism, and Pop Art.

Impressionism relates to abstraction on micro scale but realism on macro scale, and a sense of moment and quality of light are important. Expressionism is a style of art where the literal image is violently distorted to evoke emotion. In Cubism, abstract, ambiguous shallow space/deep space is exploited to suggest new spaces. Lastly, Pop Art employs themes using images of popular culture.
**Precedents in architecture**

While architectural precedents for a halfway house do not seem to exist, places of meditation and reflection have existed since before the medieval era. Referred to as monasteries, these are often sited in remote locations to remove its inhabitants from as much outside influence as possible. Charles-Édouard Jeanneret, known popularly as Le Corbusier, designed the Sainte Marie de La Tourette monastery in Lyon, France. Like many monasteries it contains a refectory, chapel, sleeping quarters, a library, and services spaces situated around a cloister. Circulation and points of control were significant considerations, as the needs of the monks required that any public who came to visit or worship were kept apart from the occupants. The size of the cell and its orientation to nature, along with the room arrangements, were the primary inspiration for the programmatic relationships to each other and to the site.

**Precedents in diagram**

Diagrams that suggest new process and representation were used as cursory visual precedent in devising the theory and representation.

“…Contrary to the notion that the diagram and the plan were distinct phases of the design process, there was a constant analogical continuity between the lines of the diagram and those of the plan. We may then ask, at what point does the diagram become a plan? … we may conclude that if there is a diagram that can generate form, *such a diagram is already form.*” (Garcia 2010)
Figure 27: Diagrammatic model for the Virtual House competition, Berlin 1997. Peter Eisenman, (Garcia 2010)

Figure 28: Diagram and sketch for Generator, White Oak, Florida, 1976-9. Cedric Price, (Garcia 2010).
Figure 29: Diagram as material. Randy Liekenjie, (Garcia 2010).
Figure 31: Foile matrix, Parc de la Villette, Paris, 1992. Bernard Tschumi (Garcia 2010)

Figure 32: Out of Line, Conceptual Diagram, Urban Competition, Postdamer Platz, Berlin, 1991. Studio Daniel Liebskind. (Garcia 2010)
Figure 33: Queen Mary Wesfield Blizzard Building, London, 2003. Will Alsop, (Garcia 2010)

Figure 34: The Block [excerpt], The Manhattan Transcripts, 1981. Bernard Tschumi, (Garcia 2010)
Figure 35: Deleuzian diagrammatic processes: field directionalties. Zaha Hadid. (Garcia 2010)

Figure 36: Venice Biennale 2008, Zaha Hadid and Patrik Schumacher, (Garcia 2010)
Figure 37: Exploded axonometric diagram, CCTV Headquarters, Beijing, 2006, OMA (Garcia 2010)

Figure 38: 3-D City Cube, study of the compact city, 2000-5, MixMax (Garcia 2010)
Component Modeling

Formal solutions were explored in a componentized environment. After a primitive base form was selected, it was divided in a manner that suited the form, site, and program—and in fact those divisions changed throughout the modeling process. The between state became not only the formal intersections and overlaps, but the lines (or lack thereof) between program states. Clarity and obscurity were selectively sought depending on the perceived requirements at any specific point of overlap and/or intersection. Models were removed from the base model, developed independently, and returned in an attempt to fit within the new understanding of the whole.

Figure 39: "Component Diagram." By author.
Figure 40: "Component Models." By author.
Figure 41: "Hyphen Component." By author.
Summary

The following is a brief summary of a year of architectural thesis work. More specifically, this summary is intended to address the culminating body of documentation, the public thesis defense, and a reflection of both. The intention here is to understand how this work is relevant and contributory to the larger body of architectural knowledge both in concept and execution, and to discuss the lessons learned along the way.

Documentation

The focus of my thesis became, primarily, the investigation of the between space in form, the interstitial Foggy Bottom site, and the program of a halfway house for convicts. The focus of the documentation was, however, more closely related to an endgame rather than a thesis. Plans, sections, elevations, section perspectives were all crafted somewhat simultaneously. While many of these drawings were relatively successful in describing something akin to a finished product, “thesis” was not a significant focal point in the documented work. Rather, the documentation became an attempt to relate the idea of being “between” into every aspect of a work of architecture.

Crafting a coordinated set of finished drawings is part of a more traditional architectural studio process, and certainly not unwelcome in a thesis presentation. However, many of my earlier investigations in animation, physical and parametric modeling, ideas of the between space, and memory in drawing, did not have a
significant presence in the final pinup. Pursuit of these ideas had fallen off shortly after the commencement of each one, and while they were all considered throughout the process they were relegated to a secondary presentation during the public thesis defense. The verbal presentation was more successful in recognizing investigations of the between space, so while leaving off much of the conceptual work was appropriate considering the overall level of development, a more successful thesis might have brought one core conceptual idea front and center in both verbal and documented form.

Presentation and Defense

As the moment in a thesis when the most focused concentration of public attention is brought to bear on a single work of architecture, it is appropriate to comment on the presentation and defense of the thesis work during this hour-long session. Reflecting on the lessons learned from this occasion is an opportunity to satisfy l'esprit d'escalier and getting in the last word. During the final weeks of the thesis investigation a part of the process became the reiterative production, rehearsal, and editing of an introduction to the work, which became the preface for this thesis.

The presentation focused on graffiti, site issues, the convict, the program, formal studies, and the models and drawings. While site was a consideration in the process it was not a significant consideration. The work was presented with a substantial introduction to the site and site history, however, which may have contributed to the jury's concentration on the relationship between the building and its site.
One critique that followed noted confusion over some of the terminology used and the definition of a halfway house, but much of this was clearly explained in the introduction and this confusion was likely the result of inexperience on the part of the juror and the idea of refocusing the definition of convict to “occupant.”

One of the clearest critiques pointed out that the spiraling promenade leading the convict from one step to another was, in reverse, the exact same circulation in a backward spiral. While the metaphor, as described by the juror, did appear incomplete, the promenade ascent from the ground floor around and through to the tower elevator was perhaps clear in the final stage, an elevator promenade, makes the final step in the circulation quite ordinary. Since the intent is to integrate the convict, perhaps the 'ordinariness' of a circulation that does not require the occupant to pass a checkpoint is in the end the most poetic way of returning him to society.

Much of the critique that followed was very much site-focused, including a suggestion that the designed spaces were “as bad as or worse than a prison.” My response to the site criticism should have brought the conversation back to the internal spaces, circulation, and the spaces between the program elements. In the end my eagerness led me to respond to criticism about site selection and contextual site response, when site selection was in fact not the primary focus of the thesis. One such critique called out the cruelty of putting convicts in such a public and open site. This reviewer's terminology kept wavering between “exposed” and “hidden,” and it became clear that by his own inability to clearly talk more specifically about the site
in fact proved that the site fulfilled the goal of a place between exposure and shelter. Another critique pointed out the inherent problems in the hand of a single architect attempting to emulate a neighborhood growing over time. However, since the intention was never to introduce this sort of contextual response, the best reply may have been to describe the formal and model-making process to that jury member in more detail, where formal components were developed in isolation, the key challenge being the moments where these components overlapped and connected together making formal “between” spaces.

Lessons Learned

In order to capture critical commentary, three primary elements will be analyzed as a proposal for future development of the ideas developed in this thesis. This analysis could also apply to any future architectural or design endeavors, theoretical professional development as it were. Specifically the discussions include the theoretical foundation, the process used to arrive at the public presentation, and the drawings, animations, and models that comprise a visual summary of the current state of the project.

The original theoretical basis for this thesis was an attempt to leverage frames, patterns, and layers to create a new image for the convict. The investigation, however, became more relevant to the idea of the convict, site, program, and form existing in between states. If, perhaps, the original thesis began along these lines, or along almost any other direct line of investigation, the thesis and documentation
might have become far clearer than its current state.

The thesis process may have also suffered from a lack of clear direction, where no
direct system of process was engaged in order to represent architectural ideas. If this
thesis had been more explicitly about investigating the process of arriving at an
architectural response then the somewhat schizophrenic path of jumping from
drawings to animations to video to modeling—without clear connections between—
might have been easier to explain, accept, or exploit.
Appendix 1: Presentation Work

Figure 42: "Dining room." By author.

Figure 43: "Program axon." By author.
Figure 44: "Program Analysis, Animation." Program Analysis_2.175.mp4. By author. 
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t9jazyBl-YE

Figure 45: "Site Analysis S1." Video by author. _S1_Analysis.mp4 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B-GiUK9kK8s
Figure 47: "Threshold, Animation." Threshold Anim1.mp4. By author. 
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KMXm3KascvA

Figure 46: "Formal study, Animation." Sequence 04-6ms delay twice.mp4. By author. 
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8RlD-K6h8Qc
Figure 49: "Site, neighborhood scale." By author.

Figure 48: "Moments of threshold." By author.
Figure 50: "Site, walking scale." By author.
Figure 51: "First floor plan." By author.
Figure 52: "Second floor plan." By author.
Figure 53: "Third floor plan." By author.
Figure 54: "Fourth floor plan." By author.
Figure 56: "Section perspective through dining room and muse." By author.

Figure 57: "Section perspective through muse." By author.
Figure 58: "Section through courtyard and muse." By author.
Figure 59: "Perspective, courtyard." By author.
Figure 60: "Perspective, stairwell." By author.
Figure 61a-60b: "Elevation, east (u); elevation, west (l)." By author.
Figure 64: "Site Flyover." Flyover.mp4. By author. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aVH8UyUc1EQ


Murphy, James. 05 Nov. 2010. Introduction to the Department of Corrections.


