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ABSTRACT:

The title “Exodus” alludes to a restricted exclave encircled by a forbidding wall—in effect, a prison on the scale of a metropolis, and one in which people sought refuge voluntarily. Over the past forty years, similar walls have grown in the city of Belfast in an increasing effort to divide its Catholic and Protestant populations. Although the troubles have subsided, the walls continue to grow creating interface zones along their edges, where civic infrastructure becomes abandoned and left to ruin. Such zones become the stage for a new urban culture invigorated by invention and subversion, each with an objective of territorial gain through a type of architectural warfare that stakes its claim on the conterminous ruins along its edge. The result is manifested in adaptive architectural typologies that reinforce the edge condition of the wall through the re-appropriation of critical infrastructure, forced to confront its intersection with barrier lines.
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The Baghdad Wall
The Baghdad Wall is the name being given by some media outlets to a 5 km long (3 mile) separation barrier being built by the 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 82nd Airborne Division of the United States Army around the predominantly Sunni district of Adhamiya in Baghdad, Iraq. Construction of the 3.6 m high (12 ft) concrete wall began on 10 April 2007.

The Chinese-Korean Border Fence
The Chinese-Korean Border Fence is a fence constructed on both sides of the 1,416-kilometre border shared between China and North Korea. This fence exists along the Yalu River and Tumen River. China has put up a massive concrete and barbed wire fence along parts of its border with North Korea to block a possible influx of refugees. China’s PLA recently conducted military exercises and deployed additional troops near the North Korean border. They have also stepped up patrols and inspections along the border. The fence is constructed of 2.5-meter-high, T-shaped concrete poles strung with barbed wire and constructed along the Yalu river with lower banks and narrower width. China had left their border lightly guarded but it has become a security concern as tens of thousands of North Korean refugees began trickling across the border. In November 2007, a U.S. official stated that China was building more “fences and installations at key border outposts”.

In August 2007, North Korea started building a fence along parts of its border with China, in an apparent move to prevent North Koreans from fleeing the country. There are posts along a 10 kilometer stretch along a narrow tributary of the Yalu River, which marks the border between North Korea and China, and has also built a road to guard the area. However, they have yet to string barbed wire fencing between the posts.

The Indo-Bangladesh barrier
The Indo-Bangladesh barrier is a 4,000 kilometer fence that India is presently constructing to seal off the Indian-Bangladesh international border in order to prevent illegal immigration and the smuggling of weapons and narcotics. It also includes installation of flood lights in the West Bengal sector. The project was sanctioned for 2881 crore rupees (600 millions US dollars) and was expected to be complete by 2009. As of November 2007, 2529 km of border fencing was completed. The barrier is just under three meters high with the aim of stopping human trafficking of and preventing smuggling and large-scale illegal immigration from Bangladesh into neighbouring Indian states. Under the former government of Khaleda Zia Bangladesh troops clashed with the Indian Border Security Force in an attempt to prevent fencing. Some indigenous Assamese fear that they, as a people, will be reduced to a minority in Assam if unabated infiltration from Bangladesh continues. In a construction project that will eventually reach 4,000 kilometres (2,500 mi), the barrier itself will be a barbed wire and concrete fence. Sections of the barrier totaling about 2,490 kilometres (1,550 mi) have been built over the past seven years. There is no clear completion date for the US $1.2 billion project yet. The barrier when complete will be patrolled by the Border Security Force. The fence will also be electrified at some stretches. In Assam, 197 km of the 263 km border has been fenced.

The Indo-Burma barrier
The Indo-Burma barrier is a separation barrier that India is presently constructing to seal off its 1,624 kilometer (975 miles)-long border with Burma. India hopes to curtail cross-border crime, including goods, arms and counterfeited Indian currency smuggling, drug trafficking, and insurgency. The United Nations Drug Control Programme (UNDCP) and International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) also warned about the poor state of border security facilities stating that the region could become a major transit point for illicit drugs. During the years 2001-2003, Indian security forces blamed the porous border for 200 security personnel and civilian deaths in militancy-related violence in the region. Four Northeast Indian states share the border with Burma: Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, Mizoram and Manipur. Both governments agreed to conduct a joint survey before erecting the fence. The Indian Home Ministry and its Burmese counterpart completed the survey within six months and in March 2003 began erecting a fence along the border.

The Iran-Pakistan barrier
The Iran-Pakistan barrier is a separation barrier which Iran has started building along its border with Pakistan replacing an intermittent tattered border fence. The 3 ft (91,4 cm) thick and 10 ft (3,048 m) high concrete wall, fortified with steel rods, will span the 700 km frontier stretching from Taftan to Mand. The project will include large earth and stone embankments and deep ditches. The border region is already dotted with police observation towers and fortress-style garrisons for troops. Iran and Pakistan do not have border disputes or other irredentist claims. The controversial wall is being constructed to stop illegal border crossings and stem the flow of drugs, and is also a response to recent terror attacks, notably the one in the Iranian border town of Zahedan on February 17, 2007, which killed thirteen people, including nine Iranian Revolutionary Guard officials.

Israeli West Bank barrier
The Israeli West Bank barrier is a separation barrier (see ‘Names of the barrier’) being constructed by the State of Israel along and within the West Bank. Upon completion, the barrier’s total length will be approximately 760 Km (twice the length of the 1949 Armistice Line (Green Line) between the West Bank and Israel). The barrier is a fence with vehicle-barrier trenches surrounded by an on average 60 meter wide exclusion area (90% of its length), and an 8 meter tall concrete wall (10% of its length). The barrier is built mainly in the West Bank and partly along the 1949 Armistice line, or ‘Green Line’ between Israel and Palestinian West Bank. 12% of the West Bank area is on the Israeli side of the barrier.
The current occupatin of the West Bank Barrier marks another round of metropolitan occupation that is heightend as new development infills its borders, eventually leaving a permanent inprint upon the urban landscape, even after the wall comes down. Astonishingly, even before the wall was completed in 2010, a proposal was made by Israel to list the wall as a UN World Heritage site.

“The West Bank Wall is a structure with outstanding universal value and provides outstanding testimony to the current struggle between the Christian and Muslim faiths. The Wall indicates the interchange of human values in a cultural area of the world, highlighting a conflict of religious beliefs and land ownership. The wall is iconic of the conflict in the Middle East and underpins the wider issues of terrorism and guerrilla warfare tactics and the defence methods employed to counter the effects. This building of the Wall / fence / barrier/ separation device illustrates a significant stage in human history and has duplicity of meaning and emotion woven within the fabric of its existence. An existence that is tricky and sensitive to address but this should not be a reason to shy from listing this important structure and protecting its integrity for future generations to contemplate and learn from. Like the ‘Berlin Wall’ and ‘Hadrian’s Wall,’ the West Bank Wall should be recognised as a valid heritage site steeped with cultural significance and although illegal, ugly, unpopular, controversial and some aspects embarrassing, should be given the same respect as a marker in history.” (West Bank Wall Discussion re World Heritage Site, from Frazer Hay)
United Arab Emirates-Oman barrier
The United Arab Emirates-Oman barrier is a separation barrier constructed by United Arab Emirates along its border with Oman in an effort to curb the flow of illegal migrants, illicit drugs and terrorists into the country.

In 2005, the United Arab Emirates and Oman formally signed maps delineating the borders between the two countries from Umm az-Zamul, in the south, northwards to east Eqaidat. The original agreement on the borders was signed in 1999.

The Mexico – United States barrier
The Mexico – United States barrier — also known in the United States as the border fence or border wall — is actually several separation barriers designed to prevent illegal movement across the Mexico – United States border. The barriers were built as part of three larger “Operations” to taper transportation of illegal drugs manufactured in Latin America and illegal immigration: Operation Gatekeeper in California, Operation Hold-the-Line in Texas, and Operation Safeguard[2] in Arizona. The barriers are strategically placed to mitigate the flow of illegal border crossings along the Mexico – United States international border into the Southwestern United States. Opponents claim the barriers are a taxpayer boondoggle, an ineffective deterrent and that the barriers inappropriately jeopardize the health and safety of those seeking illegal entry into the United States, as well as destroy animal habitat, prevent animals from reaching water, disturb animal migration patterns, and otherwise damage the environment.

Kazakhstan–Uzbekistan barrier
The Kazakhstan–Uzbekistan barrier is a 45 km-long (28 miles) separation barrier built by Kazakhstan along part of its border with Uzbekistan. Construction began on October 19, 2006. The 8 ft high barbed wire fence which includes searchlights spans the Saryagash and Maktaaral administrative districts of southern Kazakhstan[1] and is situated along heavily populated towns and cities of eastern Uzbekistan. It is being built to curb drug smuggling across the border.

Brunei/Limbang
Sharm el-Sheikh

The term Line of Control (LOC) refers to the military control line between the Indian- and Pakistani-controlled parts of the former princely state of Jammu and Kashmir—a line which, to this day, does not constitute a legally recognized international boundary but is the de facto border. Originally known as the “Cease-fire Line”, it was redesignated as the “Line of Control” following the Simla Agreement, which was signed on 3 July 1972. The part of the former princely state that is under Indian control is known as the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The two parts of the former princely state that are under Pakistani control are known as Gilgit-Baltistan and Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK). Its northern most point is known as the NJ9842.
1998

The Melilla border fence
The Melilla border fence is a separation barrier between Morocco and the Spanish city of Melilla. Constructed by Spain, its stated purpose is to stop illegal immigration and smuggling.

2001

Uzbekistan–Afghanistan barrier
The Uzbekistan–Afghanistan barrier is a separation barrier built by Uzbekistan along its 130-mile border with Afghanistan. It is most heavily guarded border in the world, second only to the barrier between North and South Korea.

Ceuta border fence
The Ceuta border fence is a separation barrier between Morocco and Spain by Ceuta, a city in the North African coast. Constructed by Spain, its purpose to stop illegal immigration and smuggling. Morocco objected to the construction of the barrier since it does not recognize Spanish sovereignty in Ceuta.

Turkmen-Uzbekistan barrier
The Turkmen-Uzbekistan barrier is a separation barrier consisting of a barbed wire fence erected by Turkmenistan along its border with Uzbekistan.

2003

Botswana/Zimbabwe

The Saudi–Yemen barrier
The Saudi–Yemen barrier is a physical barrier constructed by Saudi Arabia along part of its 1,800 kilometer (1,100 mile) border with Yemen. It consists of a network of sandbags and pipelines, three metres (10 ft) high, filled with concrete and fitted with electronic detection equipment. When construction of the 75 kilometer (45 mile) barrier began in September 2003, a fierce dispute with the Yemeni government erupted. Construction was halted in February 2004 when Saudi Arabia agreed to stop building the barrier after Yemen said the fence violated a border treaty signed in 2000. To date a reinforced concrete-filled pipeline currently acts as a security barrier along sections of the now fully demarcated border with Yemen.

Uzbekistan–Kyrgyzstan barrier
The Uzbekistan–Kyrgyzstan barrier is a separation barrier built by Uzbekistan along its border with Kyrgyzstan to prevent terrorist infiltration. Constructing began in 1999 after bomb attacks in the Uzbek capital of Tashkent were blamed on Islamic terrorists originating from Kyrgyzstan. The construction of the fence, unilaterally erected in disputed territory[1] has caused economic hardships in the poor agricultural areas of the Ferghana Valley and has separated many families in this traditionally integrated border region.

1999

Uzbekistan–Kyrgyzstan barrier
The Uzbekistan–Kyrgyzstan barrier is a separation barrier built by Uzbekistan along its border with Kyrgyzstan to prevent terrorist infiltration. Constructing began in 1999 after bomb attacks in the Uzbek capital of Tashkent were blamed on Islamic terrorists originating from Kyrgyzstan. The construction of the fence, unilaterally erected in disputed territory[1] has caused economic hardships in the poor agricultural areas of the Ferghana Valley and has separated many families in this traditionally integrated border region.

1998

The Melilla border fence
The Melilla border fence is a separation barrier between Morocco and the Spanish city of Melilla. Constructed by Spain, its stated purpose is to stop illegal immigration and smuggling.
**1979**

**Egypt-Gaza Barrier**

The Egypt-Gaza barrier refers to the Philadelphi Route along Egypt's 12 km border with the Gaza Strip, and now also to an underground metal barrier Egypt is building, in an attempt to curb the use of smuggling tunnels. It will extend 35 metres (115ft) below the surface. The Government of Egypt states that the building of the barrier as a matter of national security and aims “to secure the borders and make Egypt more safe.”

---

**1987**

**Moroccan Wall**

The Berm of Western Sahara (also known as the Moroccan Wall) is an approximately 2,700 km-long defensive structure, mostly a sand wall (or “berm”), running through Western Sahara and the southeastern portion of Morocco. It acts as a separation barrier between the Moroccan-controlled areas and the Polisario-controlled section of the territory that lies along its eastern and southern border. Part of the wall extends several kilometers into internationally recognized Mauritanian territory and the coastline and islands on both sides of the NLL are also heavily militarized.

---

**1991**

**Iraq-Kuwait Border**

The Kuwait-Iraq barrier is a 120-mile (190 km) separation barrier extending six miles (10 km) into Iraq, three miles (5 km) into Kuwait, and across the full length of their mutual border from Saudi Arabia to the Persian Gulf. Constructed by the United Nations Security Council, its stated purpose is to stop a re-invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. The barrier, made of electrified fencing and concertina wire, is braced by a 15-foot (4.6 m)-wide and 15-foot (4.6 m)-deep trench, complete with a 10-foot (3.0 m)-high dirt berm and guarded by hundreds of soldiers, several patrol boats, and helicopters. The construction of the barrier was begun in 1991. In January 2004, Kuwait decided to install a new 217 km iron separation barrier along the existing border. The stated needs were protecting the northern border, and preventing cars coming from Iraq from approaching the electricity bars.
Peace Lines, Belfast

The peace lines or peace walls are a series of separation barriers in Northern Ireland that separate Catholic and Protestant neighbourhoods. They have been built at urban “interface areas” in Belfast, Derry, Portadown and elsewhere. The stated purpose of the barriers is to minimize inter-communal violence between Catholics (who mainly self-identify as Irish) and Protestants (who mainly self-identify as British), and between nationalists and unionists.

The barriers range in length from a few hundred yards to over three miles (5 km). They may be made of iron, brick, and/or steel and are up to 25 feet (7.6 m) high. Some have gates in them (sometimes manned by police) that allow passage during daylight but are closed at night.

The first barriers were built in 1969, following the outbreak of the 1969 Northern Ireland riots and “The Troubles”. They were built as temporary structures because they were indeed meant to be temporary, lasting only six months, but due to their effective nature they have become more permanent, wider and longer. Originally few in number, they have multiplied over the years, from 18 in the early 1990s to 40 today; in total they stretch over 13 miles (21 km). Most are located in Belfast.

In recent years they have become locations for tourism. Black Taxis now take groups of tourists around Belfast's Peace Lines, trouble spots and famous murals. The most prominent barriers in the past few years separate: the nationalist Falls Road and unionist Shankill Road areas of West Belfast; the Catholic Short Strand from the Protestant Cluan Place areas of East Belfast; and the Protestant Fountain estate and Catholic Bishop Street area of Derry.

In 2008 a public discussion began about how and when the barriers could be removed. Many of the residents who live in the communities beside the peace lines have expressed their anger at any suggestion that they will be taken down.

United Nations Buffer Zone in Cyprus

The United Nations Buffer Zone in Cyprus runs for more than 180.5 kilometres (112.2 mi) along what is known as the Green Line and has an area of 346 square kilometres (134 sq mi). The zone partitions the island of Cyprus into a southern area effectively controlled by the government of the Republic of Cyprus (which is the de jure government for the entire island save for the British Sovereign Base Areas), and the northern area controlled by the Turkish army.

The term Green Line refers to the cease fire line that de facto divides the island nation of Cyprus into two, cutting through the capital of Nicosia. It was first established in 1964, when Major-General Peter Young was the commander of a “peace force”, a predecessor of the present UNFICYP. After stationing his troops in different areas of Nicosia, the general drew a cease-fire line on a map with a dark green crayon, which was to become known as the “Green Line”.

The Green Line became impassable following the July 1974 invasion by Turkey which intervened by air, sea, and land, capturing approximately 8% of Cyprus territory in response to a short lived Greek Cypriot coup. When the coup dissolved, the Turkish Armed Forces advanced to capture approximately 37% of the island and meet the “Green Line”. The meandering green line marks the southernmost points that the Turkish troops occupied during the Turkish Invasion of Cyprus in 16 August 1974. With the self-proclamation of the internationally unrecognized Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, the Green Line became its de facto southern border.

This line is also referred to as the Attila Line on some maps, named after the Turkish code-name for the 1974 military intervention: Operation Atilla. The closed off zone has become a haven for Cyprus’ wildlife, an example of an involuntary park.

Traffic across the buffer zone was very limited until 2003, when the number of crossings and the rules governing them were relaxed.

Kruger National Park

Kruger National Park is one of the largest game reserves in Africa. It covers 18,989 square kilometres (7,332 sq mi) and extends 360 kilometres (220 mi) from north to south and 65 kilometres (40 mi) from east to west.

Exodus - Rem Koolhaus
1961

The Berlin Wall
The Berlin Wall (German: Berliner Mauer) was a barrier constructed by the German Democratic Republic (GDR, East Germany) starting on 13 August 1961, that completely cut off West Berlin from surrounding East Germany and from East Berlin. The barrier included guard towers placed along large concrete walls, which circumscribed a wide area (later known as the "death strip") that contained anti-vehicle trenches, "fakir beds" and other defenses. The Soviet-dominated Eastern Bloc officially claimed that the wall was erected to protect its population from fascist elements conspiring to prevent the "will of the people" in building a socialist state in East Germany. However, in practice, the Wall served to prevent the massive emigration and defection that marked Germany and the communist Eastern Bloc during the post–World War II period.

1960

China/Hong Kong Barrier
The Berlin Wall was officially referred to as the "Anti-Fascist Protection Rampart" (German: Antifaschistischer Schutzwall) by GDR authorities, implying that neighbouring West Germany had not been fully de-Nazified. The West Berlin city government sometimes referred to it as the "Wall of Shame" – a term coined by mayor Willy Brandt – while condemning the Wall's restriction on freedom of movement. Along with the separate and much longer Inner German border (IGB) that demarcated the border between East and West Germany, both borders came to symbolize the "Iron Curtain" between Western Europe and the Eastern Bloc.

Before the Wall's erection, 3.5 million East Germans circumvented Eastern Bloc emigration restrictions and defected from the GDR, many by crossing over the border from East Berlin into West Berlin, from where they could then travel to West Germany and other Western European countries. Between 1961 and 1989, the wall prevented almost all such emigration. During this period, around 5,000 people attempted to escape over the wall, with estimates of the resulting death toll varying between 100 and 200.

In 1989, a radical series of political changes occurred in the Eastern Bloc, associated with the liberalization of the Eastern Bloc's authoritarian systems and the erosion of political power in the pro-Soviet governments in nearby Poland and Hungary. After several weeks of civil unrest, the East German government announced on 9 November 1989 that all GDR citizens could visit West Germany and West Berlin. Crowds of East Germans crossed and climbed onto the wall, joined by West Germans on the other side in a celebratory atmosphere. Over the next few weeks, a euphoric public and souvenir hunters chipped away parts of the wall; the governments later used industrial equipment to remove most of the rest. The fall of the Berlin Wall paved the way for German reunification, which was formally concluded on 3 October 1990.

1953

The Korean Wall
The Korean wall is a concrete barrier that was allegedly built along the length of the DMZ in South Korea between 1977 and 1979. North Korea contends in the area south of the Military Demarcation Line, which cuts across our country at its waist, there is a concrete wall which [...] stretches more than 240 km (149 mi) from east to west, is 5–8 m (16–26 ft) high, 10–19 m (33–62 ft) thick at the bottom, and 3–7 m (10–23 ft) wide in the upper part. It is set with wire entanglements and dotted with gun embrasures, look-outs and varieties of military establishments [...] the South Korean rulers built this wall over a period of many years from 1977. In December 1999, Chu Chang Jun, North Korea's longtime ambassador to China, repeated claims that a "wall" divided Korea. He said the south side of the wall is packed with soil, which permits access to the top of the wall and makes it effectively invisible from the south side. He also claimed that it served as a bridgehead for any northward invasion. The alleged Korean Wall in the Demilitarized Zone seen through binoculars from the North Korean side. According to the United States, the wall does not exist, although there are anti-tank barriers along some sections of the DMZ.
Modern Security Barriers by Length (km)
Exodus served as a proposition to erase a portion of central London to establish and zone of metropolitan life there. This section would be protected by walls from the old city, creating division and contrast, much like the Berlin Wall did. The people who chose to live in this zone would become “The Voluntary Prisoners of Architecture”. The occupation of this metropolitan infrastructure serves to preserve a central artery of space amidst the heart of the urban fabric. Over the course of occupation, its borders become fortified by the build-up of the metropolis that surrounds it, preserving traces of its presence even after it has dissappeared. The removal of these evasive forms will leave unprecedented stains of unthinkable value in their formal, cultutal and social occupation through void space. Their occupation and removal of their infrastructural pieces permits a retooling of thea metropolis, guided by the ability to preserve its former traces which serve as a catalyst to the production of architectural form.

“The great surprise: the wall was heartbreakingly beautiful . Maybe after the ruins of Pompii, Herculaneum, and the Roman Forum, it was the most purely beautiful remnant of an urban condition, breathtaking in its persistent doubleness. The same phenomenon offered, over a length if 165 kilometers, radically different meanings, spectacles, interpretations, realities. It was impossible to imagine another recent artifact with the same signifying potency. And there was more: in spite of its apparent absence of program, the wall-in its relatively short life-had provoke and sustained an incredible number of events, behaviors, and effects.”(Rem Koolhaus, “The Berlin Wall as Architecture | Field Trip: (A) A Memoir”, from SMLXL)
AFTER EXODUS

How does one sensitively mediate through the traces left by these walls, while simultaneously occupying their voids?

The last century has shown a significant decline in the number of fortification walls built. The wall is no longer able to serve the same function it once did to the city, due to the transfigurations the urban landscape has undergone in the last century. The extents of the city have grown so far, its peripheral edges are hard to define. Multiple cities have blurred into onto another; their suburbs seem to sprawl on forever.¹

The way in which cities are breached have also changed, no longer enabling the modern metropolis to close itself off from the outside world. “In banks, in supermarkets, and on major highways, where tollbooths resembles the ancient city gates, the rite of passage was no longer intermittent. It had become immanent…the city was entered not through a gate nor through an arc de triomphe, but rather through an electronic audience system”.² For this reason, the city wall has since been forced to fulfilled different objectives through its occupation.

Much can be taken from Rem Koolhaus’s Exodus, where the wall becomes an occupied space, disconnected from the city that stands right outside its perimeter. In this proposal, the wall is not erased, but rather, re-propositioned as a utopian exodus within a city of eventual ruin. “Division, isolation, inequality, aggression, destruction, all the negative aspects of the Wall, could be the ingredients of a new phenomenon: architecture warfare against undesirable conditions…”³ The proposal stems from the conditions of West-Berlin, view as a walled-in utopia to the East, that although was a sort of urban-prison, became the desirable of the two sides.

The affects of the wall are not restricted to the void that runs through the centre of Berlin, but are ever apparent in the traces of its opposing sides. The city’s allocation of infrastructure, building, and monument has all been referenced in some way by their proximity to the divide. The thesis therefore cannot be restricted to the physical occupied zone of the fortification wall, but must, to a certain degree, be inclusive of the peripheral areas it has intrinsically shaped.

¹ Deyan Sudjic and Philip Sayer, “The Image of the City”, The 100 Mile City, (San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1992)
Almost immediately after the fall of the Berlin Wall, plans to reconstruct Berlin were underway, launching an excess of polemical debate over the future of the country’s capital. Since then, the urban landscape has undergone massive change, a consequence of a city desperately trying to reclaim a past overshadowed by the unfathomable events of twentieth century. After the Second World War, the city’s reconstruction fell under the influence of its occupied forces that sought to rid Berlin of its historical traces and impose new order and ideals through built form; this was especially so in the East. The eradication of such traces has caused a cultural identity crises, evident today in the city’s ongoing obsession to reconstruct and reconcile its past. On one hand, Berlin is making significant efforts to redefine itself through restoration of many historical landmarks and even new museums and memorials intended to house the countless artifacts the city has left behind as evidence of its past. At the same time, Berlin makes too much of an effort to conceal its wounds, a consequence of filling in and erasing the traces of its more regretful recent history. The largest of these erasures takes place along the stretch of the former Berlin Wall, a site today that is almost untraceable in many parts of the city.

The decision to rebuild is motivated by the belief that history should not be easily erased. However, reviving one history often causes another to be lost. Consequently, rebuilding often becomes a process of deciding which history is more important to preserve. For Berlin to look to the future, it must first appease its past. Attempts to do so are apparent in a landscape of recent reconstruction. These reconstructions deny history of its traces by imposing prescribed selective histories upon its viewer. However, without these reconstructions their absence results in a psychological adversity far more devastating than any aesthetic loss.¹ This sets the stage for debate regarding the act of reconstruction within the former wall zone, in post-unified Berlin.

The East Side Gallery is among few authentic sites left in Berlin today. It is the longest remaining stretch left of the Berlin Wall left standing and is located near the centre of Berlin on Mühlenstrasse in Friedrichshain. The Wall holds countless murals and markings left from when the Wall was built. In the early nineties, artists were invited to come and paint murals along the stretch of the preserved wall which has since been victim to weathering, graffiti, and lack of upkeep. Preservationists argue that the Wall needs to be restored, however, restoration of the murals would only falsify the legitimacy of the artifact at hand. The murals themselves are artifacts of a reflection of a specific time and place just as much as the graffiti on top of them is. The most recent graffiti often speaks to more current issues both in Berlin

and the rest of the world and is just as much a documentation of such. To cleanse the Wall and impose a selective representation would be to deprive it of its power. The same can be said for the continual filling in of the void left today by its removal.

The discouraging loss of historical landmarks has forced Berlin to have to redefine itself, while it attempts to rewrite its history. The city is in a constant state of modification that layers over, hides and inevitably erases its past, making the protection of its historic landscapes next to impossible. This is often the case where one history is lost as the expense of reviving another. In the case of the Wall, the pursuit of reclaiming these landscapes leads to countless reconstructions plagued with overcoming a slew of criticism inclusive of issues of cultural authenticity and selective history. Ironically, it is the void that least signifies erasure. However it is unreasonable to expect a city subject itself to the occupation of its ruins. If we are to accept that the act of reconstruction needs to take place, the question is, how should the void rebuild itself and what will that reconstruction do to preserve its former occupant’s traces. One option is to look toward local building tendencies so that the act of reconstruction either premises itself on the act of building with traditional methods or doing the complete opposite, as a means of making that threshold ever-apparent amidst the urban landscape.

In the case of Berlin, the city has been successful at maintaining a single architectural style based on prescribed local aesthetics among many of its recently reconstructed sites, most of which follow former historical building footprints. This describes both principals of “Kritische Reconstruction” and Berlinische Architektur both used as drivers for reconstruction since the fall of the Wall. Berlinische Architektur is an amalgamation of both Prussian and Nazi Architecture, recognized by its stripped stuccoed or stoned surfaces, organized by a grid-like pattern of fenestration and minimal ornamentation. The architecture looks sterile, a consequence of its homogenized aesthetical treatment. The style most likely became associated with Berlin during the second half of the 19th century when the Industrial Revolution caused a building boom in housing, resulting in the construction of Berlin’s Mietskaserne; five story residential buildings built throughout Berlin, designed in the Berlinische Architektur style. The aesthetic simplicity and repetition of these buildings serve to compliment Berlin’s older, more ostentatious Prussian landmarks that act as visual anchors throughout the City. “Kritische Reconstruction, [translated Critical Reconstruction], is a general desire for an idealized European urbanity. “the game of street and block,” translated into rebuilding the old street pattern with facades of Berlinische Architektur.” These principles for reconstruction were used in the re-planning of Pariser Platz, a site that fell within the divide. One of the stipulations for the building in the plaza was that all the

buildings should be symmetrical, despite the fact that this was not the case with the buildings previously on the site.\textsuperscript{7} Materials were to be limited to only those which harmonize with the Brandenburg Gate on the west end of the square.\textsuperscript{8} In addition, the plaza design was to be based on the footprints of pre-war buildings. Pariser Platz 3, designed by Frank Gehry, was tightly limited by these zoning requirements. His trademark use of steel paneling and glass were used on the inside of the building, not visible from the plaza.\textsuperscript{9} Deeply recessed windows run symmetrically along the front of the building which is clad in limestone, similar in color to the Brandenburg Gate.\textsuperscript{10} The austere façade is, however, misleading. “Behind its carefully constructed contextual façades, Pariser Platz 3 is a reversal of solids and voids: the skin and vestibule are all “mass”; the interior is a fluid and transparent singular space.”\textsuperscript{11}

The aesthetic continuity that exists today in Berlin speaks to the influence city officials have had in the past and present over building practices in Berlin and signals a recognizable preference for historical aesthetics, particularly in the city centre, on the sites formerly occupied by the Wall. The effects of such influence that have perpetrated this architectural continuity have helped to give Berlin a distinctive civic identity that sets it apart from its counterparts, but at the same time it has somewhat restricted the current discourse of architecture from being put into practice where it may best be suited. The battle between both methodologies of design are at a constant battle between each other, calling to question what ultimately is at stake. The preference for following these stringent planning guidelines, blurs the threshold of the Wall as the new becomes indistinguishable from the old.

Additionally, it is important to recognize that this threshold no longer holds the same functional accountability it once did. “...since the original enclosures, the concept of boundary has undergone numerous changes as regards both the facade and the neighborhood it fronts. From the palisade to the screen, by way of stone ramparts, the boundary-surface has recorded innumerable perceptive and imperceptible transformations, of which the latest is probably that of the interface. Once again, we have to approach the question of access to the City in a new manner. For example, does the metropolis possess its own façade? At which moment does the city show is its face?\textsuperscript{12} The face of the city is no longer something tangible. Its doors are scattered throughout, as its inhabitants enter through its airports, train stations, roads and tunnels. We have also not considered the accessibility of the city through the digital.

So what of the city’s former face? The threshold marker is still present, and just as effective in mediating its two sides, but in a very different way. In the case of the modern metropolis, the city’s former façade has been absorbed

within a greater network. Its traces, however prevalent, are responsible for urban conditions that could never be artificially created. They are the product of a palimpsest; layered by the ongoing building and demolishing of space over time. In the case of Berlin, its face lies in its centre.
Unionists and Nationalists

The conflict in Northern Ireland can be most easily understood as a conflict between two major groups. The first, the Unionists, comprise of about 60% of the population in Northern Ireland and regard themselves as British. Unionists support the United Kingdom’s current rule over Northern Ireland.¹ This group is mainly comprised of Protestants. The second group is referred to as Nationalists, making up just over and increasing 40% of the population in Northern Ireland. The Nationalists believe that Northern Ireland should be a part of a united Ireland. The group is mainly comprised of Catholics. There is a third group, comprised of just a few percent of the population in Northern Ireland, that believe they should be neither part of the UK or Ireland, but rather separate. This group is comprised of both Catholics and Protestants.

(Left) The map highlights lands claimed by both Catholics and Protestants. White zones in between indicate interface areas; conflict zones most susceptible to clashed between sectarian sides.

(background) Giant ganty cranes used to build ships.
(forground) Shipyard workers leave Queen’s Island

Catholics and Protestants

The conflict between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland dates back centuries. Both sectarian groups have significant historical claims on the land, making it difficult pick sides between both factions. Nationalists claim Ireland was taken from them in 1169 during the Anglo-Norman invasion which has since then, led to England’s domination over Northern Ireland.¹ At the time of the invasion, England was Catholic. In the 16th century, King Henry III broke his allegiance with Rome making England Protestant while Ireland remained Catholic. The event marks the religious division between both Catholics and Protestants.

In the early years of the next century, Catholic’s would loose their land as Protestant land ownership rose from five percent to over eighty percent, instigating Catholics to rise up against Protestants. In 1649, thousands of Irish were massacred by English military and political leader, Oliver Cromwell. Finally in 1690, when King William of Orange defeated James II, the Catholic king of England and Scotland, at the Battle of Boyne, Protestants secured complete rule over the territory.² Over the next few centuries, penal laws were passes ensuring Protestant dominance in Ireland until Ireland’s uprising in 1798 that gained them independence form England. In 1801, the Act of Union was passed integrating the Irish Parliament into the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland.

Amidst Belfast’s mid-19th century rise to becoming a major industrial capitol, working Catholics staged interface riots in response to social inequities. Catholics filled the majority of gritty labor positions in socially segregated industries like ship building and linen manufacturing while Protestant workers filled the majority percent of higher paying managerial positions. The 19th century was marked by a Catholic struggle to gain land and control under Protestant-rule.

The outbreak of World War I forced Catholics and Protestants to fight side by side, causing the differences among the two factions to subside until 1919 when the Irish Republican Army (IRA) fought to gain control of Ireland. One year later, the British government partitioned Ireland into two halves, giving control of the south to Nationalists. Until the declaration of the Irish Republic in 1948, this southern half of the division was known as the Irish Free State. The division was meant to be temporary as the British hoped the state would unify into the Commonwealth however the division between the Nationalists in the south and Unionists in the north grew after the division. Catholic minorities

bombed building caused by sectarian violence during the troubles. Notice the filled-in windows on the first story.
in the north were discriminated against and Protestants in the north remained under constant threat of the IRA in the South. Compared to earlier periods in the city’s history, the postwar years showed less sectarian violence due to higher employment and improved social conditions, perhaps indebted to joint war-time initiatives.

This sociological shift during the first World War is similar to early European settlements, which were exclusive to ethnic and religious minorities. However, as settlements went through their initial stages of growth, attacks from outsiders would increase, bringing together all those that shared the common interest in the protection of the city. In the case of Belfast, this sociological shift was most apparent during the first two World Wars and the years that directly followed. It was thought during the late forties, the improved social conditions meant that past outbreaks might not be repeated. However, as political and labor unions struggled in the coming years, a brewing strife and resentment among the Catholics widened the gap among the social divid. The problems would eventually lead to a nearly three decade battle of ethno-political violence led by the IRA against the Unionists/Protestant majority. This period of conflict is referred to as ‘the Troubles’. The British government claims it played a neutral role in the conflict, sending in forces to uphold law in Northern Ireland, however Irish Republicans regarded the British to collude with loyalist paramilitaries.

The Troubles marked a period of terror, followed by mass migration within the city’s inner neighborhoods. During the Troubles, over 1000 of the 1810 fatal incidents from 1960 to July 1983 occurred in the Belfast urban area. Between 1969 and 1973 alone, mass migration within the city occurs. An estimated 60,000 Belfast residents moved to neighborhoods where their ethnic group was dominate. In March of 1993, the UK paper, the Independent, stated that of Belfast’s fifty-one electoral wards, thirty-five were dominated by one religious group that made up ninety percent or more of the population.

The 1998 Good Friday Agreement brought an official end to the intertwined Nationalist (Irish/British) and Religious (Catholic/Protestant) conflict which had raged in Northern Ireland for over thirty years. With this national level peace process came the cessation of paramilitary violence between Republican and Unionist factions in the city of Belfast, where the vast majority of sectarian incidents took place during the Troubles, and the city has since become one of the central case studies within the burgeoning literature on urban planning and conflict resolution.

---

Since the good Friday Agreement, the city of Belfast has invested in countless construction projects aimed at revitalizing its city centre and waterfront industrial quarters. The civic investment marks a rebirth the 19th century industrial city that, like many cities of its kind, faced a slow decline over the latter half of the proceeding century. However, it is critical to recognize that although the city is undergoing significant economic and urban investment, there still exists significant tension between it’s Catholic and Protestant populations.

(right) Arrows signify pushes by Catholic and Protestant sides for territorial land gains. White lines indicate peaceline borders. 
(below) Abandoned housing in one of Belfasts’ Interface Areas.
Of the over 10,000 bombings that occurred during ‘the troubles’, 41% hit the urban area of Belfast with 70% of those aimed at local housing.\(^1\) The purpose of these attacks were predominantly a result of both sectarian sides staking territorial claims over one another.

The violence in Belfast can be compared to the conflict in Jerusalem between Israelis and Palestinians. In the case of Jerusalem, the city is burdened with the added layer of site-specific, religious, territorial claims that date back thousands of years. This is not the case with Belfast, as although like in the case of Jerusalem, both sides are invested in territorial gain, there is less significance of one site over another. However, the problem does become difficult in the intertwined distribution of its populations that make it impossible for the city to divide itself into two. To make matters more complex, if we look at the siting of churches and schools, the issue of circulation and accessibility is somewhat of a planning nightmare. Many of these institutions get stuck on the wrong side of the line. Perceived “neutral venues” are far from few as individuals from one ethnic group will not use near-by facilities because it is perceived to fall within the other groups territory.\(^2\)

Planning efforts in the mid-20th century put emphasis on physical and spatial concerns, disregarding issues of localized ethnic conflict.\(^3\) The Belfast Regional survey and plan of 1962 proposed developing a “stop line” around the metropolitan area to limit sprawl during future growth, and to develop new towns outside the stop line to absorb spillover from the city limits.\(^4\) The initial assumption of planning for Belfast in the 1960’s asserted that planning cannot be expected to influence ethnographic factors.

“It would be presumptuous, however, to imagine that the Urban Area Plan could be expected to influence religious... factors. Our proposals are designed specifically to facilitate individual and community choice, so that the social pattern desired by the individual and the community may readily be built up.\(^5\)

(right) Distribution of Catholic and Protestant Churches and Schools.

---

4 Matthew R. H. Sir, Belfast Regional Survey and Plan 1962 (Belfast: HMSO, 1964)
5 Building Design Partnership. Belfast Urban Area Plan (Belfast: BDP, 1969)
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Cost of Crime Per Year: Per One Residence of Belfast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CRIME</th>
<th>TOTAL COST OF CRIME</th>
<th>POLICE RECORDED CRIME (NO. 02-03)</th>
<th>BCS MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>ESTIMATE OF ACTUAL NO. OF OFFENCES</th>
<th>AVERAGE COST PER OFFENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wounding/GBH/AOABH (incl. with intent)</td>
<td>£890,630,000</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6,851</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>£17,600,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>£1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All robbery</td>
<td>£38,455,000</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7,691</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary in a dwelling</td>
<td>£18,929,000</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8,230</td>
<td>£2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a vehicle</td>
<td>£20,481,600</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4,267</td>
<td>£4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual offences</td>
<td>£20,748,000</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>£19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>£18,480,000</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>184,800</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary in a non-dwelling</td>
<td>£11,442,600</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4,238</td>
<td>£2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All criminal damage</td>
<td>£50,799,000</td>
<td>11,519</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>72,570</td>
<td>£700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a vehicle</td>
<td>£5,483,320</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9,454</td>
<td>£580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other theft</td>
<td>£25,268,460</td>
<td>7,507</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>74,319</td>
<td>£340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common/aggravated assault</td>
<td>£4,887,540</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9,051</td>
<td>£540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost to city</td>
<td>£1,123,204,520</td>
<td>39,115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,266,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using census 2001 population data the cost per head has been calculated. The population of Belfast at the last count (2001 census) was 277,391.

Based on this formula, therefore, it is estimated that the cost of crime to each resident of Belfast is in the region of £4,049 the cost to each resident aged 18 - 65 is approximately £6,748 per year.

Long Term Policy for Northern Ireland


Using census 2001 population data the cost per head has been calculated. The population of Belfast at the last count (2001 census) was 277,391.

Based on this formula, therefore, it is estimated that the cost of crime to each resident of Belfast is in the region of £4,049 the cost to each resident aged 18 - 65 is approximately £6,748 per year.
**Ten Wards With Highest Crime for All Recorded Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Crime Rate per 100 People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncairn</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanic</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lodge</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymacarrett</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Works</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Park</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religious Composition of Belfast City Population 1751-2011**

[Graph showing the religious composition from 1751 to 2011]

Using census 2001 population data, the cost per head has been calculated. The population of Belfast at the last count (2001 census) was 277,391. Based on this formula, therefore, it is estimated that the cost of crime to each resident of Belfast is in the region of £4,049. The cost to each resident aged 18 - 65 is approximately £6,748 per year.
Recorded Crime Across Northern Ireland 2002/03 AND 2010/11

Actual population per area

Violence against the person per 1000 population

Domestic burglary per 1000 households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymena</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymoney</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbridge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlereagh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookstown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigavon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungannon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fermanagh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limavady</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisburn</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magherafelt</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newry &amp; Mourne</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtownabbey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Down</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omagh</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabane</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theft of vehicle per 1000 population 2, 3

All recorded crime per 1000 population 2, 3, 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ards</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymena</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymoney</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbridge</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlereagh</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookstown</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigavon</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungannon</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fermanagh</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larne</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limavady</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisburn</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magherafelt</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newry &amp; Mourne</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtownabbey</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Down</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omagh</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabane</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ards</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymena</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymoney</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbridge</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlereagh</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookstown</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigavon</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungannon</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fermanagh</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larne</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limavady</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisburn</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magherafelt</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newry &amp; Mourne</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtownabbey</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Down</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omagh</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabane</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over the next decade, Belfast lost 150,000, nearly one third, of its residents. This is a result of three factors:

First, a decline in population occurred due to out-migration, encouraged by the 1962 plan, ethnic conflict within the region, and a fall in the birth rate. Second, by the mid 1970’s, the city was experiencing economic shocks that weakened the city’s job market. And third, increased ethnic segregation and the establishment of both Catholic and Protestant zones in and around the downtown core.

“A situation now exists where generally people are prepared to be housed only in what they regard as “their own areas.” Whilst every effort will be made to break down these barriers, it will inevitably take many years to remove them completely. In the meantime the position as it now exists must be recognized and taken into account in the development of new housing areas.”

Both the 1962 plan and the 1977 plans noted the increasing territorial divide between Protestants and Catholics. At the time, planning was in support of the increasing divisions, and backed by the UK government. Both planners and politicians sought to accommodate the dividing city. Even in 2001, the Belfast Urban Area (BUA) Plan 2001 was similar to the previous two plans in that it set itself apart from social and economic issues in the region.

“...The principles of urban policy engagement in Belfast have crystallized around government objectives to produce color-neutral impacts on city residents as a means toward stabilizing a volatile city. Government is not unaware of sectarian realities, but seeks policies and programs that are not viewed as disproportionately favoring one side over the other. In this way, government seeks neutrality, or “grayness,” in policy impact in a situation where sectarian color matters. Town planning has largely assigned sectarian issues to policy domains that are outside its responsibility, leaving the city with no comprehensive or strategic approach to dealing with sectarian divisions.”

The disregard for presence of inferred ethnographic lines, can lead to poor planning practices that will ultimately result in a further decline of the city’s already diminishing population. For example, a decision by the Department of Education to close a public school based solely on student enrollment can have devastating effects.

---

on a one ethnographic community, particularly if that school is the only one in the neighborhood unofficially deemed Catholic or Protestant. Residents are most likely to relocate once public services shut down causing population to decline and housing stock to erode.¹¹

According to the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE), the 1991 city population in Belfast was 279,000; the population of Belfast Urban Area is just under half a million people. If we include the exurban suburbs, the total population rises to about 750,000, approximately half of the population of Northern Ireland today.¹² Of that number, an estimated 57% were Protestant; the rest Catholic. In recent years, the Catholic population has continued to outgrow the Protestant population due to increased birth rates and Protestant migration to adjoining towns.¹³ Peacelines have created a housing imbalance; Protestants, due to migration have higher vacancy rates than in overcrowded Catholic neighborhoods. As a result, Catholic houses are being built closer and closer to peace-lines and where housing demands cannot be met, new housing is constructed outside the urban centre where many houses lie vacant within Protestant lines. Moreover, the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) has been forced to invest millions of dollars in up-keeping many of these vacant properties within Protestant lines to maintain community viability. The shortage of land on the Catholic side has caused high rise buildings to spring up in due to the increasing housing demands. These larger buildings have been mistaken by the Protestants as symbols of territoriality.

THE WALL
The Wall

The history of the security wall can be traced back to the Citadel, which first appeared around 300 BCE.¹ The Citadel is the architectural form which the city grew around. As cities expanded, new walls were built, redefining the limits of the city intended to defend its people and stockpiles from raiders in the hinterlands.² New perimeter walls were a sign of prosperity and wealth. They defined the city's image, its size. The walled city was a social fortress; its spaces within its walls defined its public space. Where city walls were once the place of security, today that is no longer the case.

The defensive value of the wall has been overturned. Today, “The physical partitioned city has many cousins: the racial ghetto, the abandoned core, the neighborhood “redlined” by lending banks, and the increasingly popular gate residential community.”³ New forms of walls have appeared in the city manifested by highways, fences, railroad tracks, polluted river banks. The wall is no longer able to serve the same function it once did to the city, due to the transfigurations the urban landscape has undergone in the last century. The way in which cities are breached have changed, no longer enabling the modern metropolis to close itself off from the outside world. “In banks, in supermarkets, and on major highways, where tollbooths resembles the ancient city gates, the rite of passage was no longer intermittent. It had become immanent…the city was entered not through a gate nor through an arc de triomphe, but rather through an electronic audience system”. For this reason, the city wall has since been forced to fulfilled different objectives through its occupation.

(left) “This large stone-walled fort, located on the summit of Grianan Mountain commanding views over Lough Swilly and the River Foyle and counties Donegal, Derry and Tyrone. Grianan Ailligh was the royal citadel of the northern Ui Neill from the 5th to the 12th century.”⁴

---

¹ Jon Calame and Esther Ruth Charlesworth, Divided Cities: Belfast, Beirut, Jerusalem, Mostar, and Nicosia (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2009) 22
² Jon Calame and Esther Ruth Charlesworth, Divided Cities: Belfast, Beirut, Jerusalem, Mostar, and Nicosia (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2009) 19
In the case of the modern city, defining the boundaries of what we constitute as the city have become increasingly difficult as borders are blurred. “The major invention of urban historians of the 1960’s was the idea of the megalopolis, introducing a perception of great cities metamorphosing into amorphous urban regions spreading halfway across an entire country.” The extents of the city have grown so far, its peripheral edges are hard to define. Multiple cities have blurred into onto another; their suburbs seem to sprawl on forever. As a result, cutting off regions by their peripheral edges is no longer as clear-cut as it used to be. This begins to explain the fragmented nature of Belfast’s peacelines, walls that mark off only portions of ethnographic regions. Over 30 partition segments exist today and plans to construct new ones are in the works perpetuating significant ongoing reconfiguration within the city.

The construction of the security wall is made manifest as a sort of architectural warfare on the city, not only at its collision points but far beyond through a countless redirection of flows, migration of its surrounding population, and re-situation of goods and services that fall victim to one side or another. It’s integration into the city perpetuates a violent reorganization of the urban form, most apparent at the point of intersection where an instant freeze paralysis everything within a radius of the zone; everything outside this zone continue to grow around it.

(left) The city is divided by dispersed fragments of security walls, known as ‘peacelines’, that mark the fault-line of what the city has called interface zones; critical points within the urban fabric where both Catholic and Protestant resentment collides. The map indicates both Catholic (gray) and Protestant (hatched) zones.

Buildings caught on the edges of the interface zone are appropriated by the wall.

Due to Provisional IRA activity in the area, the British Army constructed an observation post on the roof in the 1970s and occupied the top two floors of the building. At the height of the Troubles, the Army was only able to access the post by helicopter.

Security Gates close the junction between roads.
Buildings caught on the edges of the interface zone are appropriated by the wall. Due to Provisional IRA activity in the area, the British Army constructed an observation post on the roof in the 1970s and occupied the top two floors of the building. At the height of the Troubles, the Army was only able to access the post by helicopter.
South West Belfast
1. Camanmore Park, Suffolk
2. Thornswood Road, Suffolk
3. Grantham Drive - Malinmore Park, Suffolk
4. Kells Avenue, Suffolk

West Belfast
5. Moyard
6. Springmartin Road - Upper Ballygomartin Road
7. Springhill Avenue
8. Workman Avenue
9. Springfield Road/Workman Avenue
10. Lanark Way
11. Cupar Way
12. North Howard Street
13. Northumberland Street
14. Percy Street - Boundary Way
15. Townsend Street
16. Roden Street

East Belfast
17. Bryson Street
18. Madrid Street
19. Clandeboye Gardens and Langtry Court
20. Clandeboye Gardens/Cuan Place
21. Starling Walk

North Belfast
22. Duncairn Gardens – New Lodge
23. Duncairn Gardens – Tigers Bay
24. Adam Street
25. Henry Street - Westlink
26. Newington Street
27. Mountcollyer – Parkend Street
28. Alexandra Park
29. White City – Whitewell
30. Navarra Place
31. Longlands – Whitewell
32. Oldpark Road - Rosapenna Street - Rosevale Street - Manor Street
33. Torrens - Wyndham Street
34. Torrens - Oldpark Road
35. Oldpark Avenue
36. Crumlin Road - Flax Street
37. Woodvale - Holy Cross
38. Mountainview Park - Mountainview Parade
39. Alliance Avenue
40. Wolfend Drive - Squires Hill
41. Brookmill Way – Squires Hill
1. South West Belfast
2. West Belfast
3. Moyard
4. Springmartin Road - Upper Ballygomartin Road
5. Springhill Avenue
6. Workman Avenue
7. Lanark Way
8. Cupar Way
9. North Howard Street
10. Northumberland Street
11. Percy Street – Boundary Way
12. Townsend Street
13. Roden Street
14. East Belfast
15. Bryson Street
16. Madrid Street
17. Clandeboye Gardens and Langtry Court
18. Clandeboye Gardens/Cluan Place
19. Strand Walk
20. North Belfast
21. Duncairn Gardens – New Lodge
22. Duncairn Gardens – Tigers Bay
23. Adam Street
24. Henry Street – Westlink
25. Newington Street
26. Mountcollyer – Parkend Street
27. Alexandra Park
28. White City – Whitewell
29. Navarra Place
30. Longlands – Whitewell
31. Oldpark Road - Rosapenna Street - Rosevale Street - Manor Street
32. Torrens - Wyndham Street
33. Torrens - Oldpark Road
34. Oldpark Avenue
35. Crumlin Road - Flax Street
36. Woodvale - Holy Cross
37. Mountainview Park - Mountainview Parade
38. Alliance Avenue
39. Wolfend Drive - Squires Hill
40. Brookmill Way – Squires Hill
No. 1. Carnarnmore Park, Suffolk (1980s): A 2 metre high steel fence runs from the junction of Stewartsown Road between rear of houses in Carnarnmore Park and the Glen River. The fence ends abruptly while adjacent path continues.

No. 2. Stewartsown Road, Suffolk (1990s) A short section of fence at the rear of Carnarnmore Park and Donegore Gardens. The fence runs from Stewartsown Road (opposite Suffolk Road) to the junction with Blacks Road.

No. 3. Oranmore Drive - Malinmore Park, Suffolk A steel fence runs from Blacks Road parallel to Oranmore Drive to the junction with Willowvale Avenue. A second fence runs parallel to this at the rear of Brook Drive and Brook Close and then turns 90 degrees at rear of River Close. A double fence cuts across Willowvale Avenue, across the end of Suffolk Drive to join a fence surrounding the Lidl supermarket on Stewartsown Road.

No. 4. Kells Avenue, Suffolk (1970s - 2000): A wall and gates close off the junction of Kells Avenue with Stewartsown Road. The barrier has two pedestrian gates and one vehicle gate. This is effectively a continuation of the Oranmore Drive barrier. There is a further security fence along the face of Stewartsown Road in front of two portacabins used by Suffolk Community Services Group, while a wooden fence runs at the rear of the properties on Ringford Crescent. Further security walls and fences protect properties in Lenadoon on the opposite side of Stewartsown Road from close to the Woodburn PSNI station to opposite the library.

No. 5. Moyard (1991): A steel fence 2 metre high runs from the rear of Moyard Parade, across the rear of Moyard Crescent. It continues across the head of Springfield Park and at the rear of houses at Springfield Heights. The fence separates the various properties from rough hillside and grazing land.

No. 6. Springmartin Road - Upper Ballygromartin Road (1990 + 1994): A 5 metre high wall and fence runs from the junction of Springfield Road and Springmartin Road, parallel with Springmartin Road until 30 metres from the junction with Ballygromartin Road. There is a substantial buffer zone on either side of the wall. A short return fence runs at right angles to the end of the main barrier, and continues at the rear of houses at Springfield Park as a continuation of the main Springmartin barrier.

No. 7. Springhill Avenue (1989): A wall with a steel fence in front closes off Springhill Avenue at the junction with Springfield Road, facing New Barnsley PSNI station. The security wall continues the length of Springhill Avenue at the rear of Springfield Heights, Gardens and Close and the rear of Westrock Court. In the other direction from Springhill Avenue a low security wall continues along Springfield Road at the rear of properties on Springhill Crescent.

No. 8. Workman Avenue (1990): A gate with a pedestrian entrance closes off access to Workman Avenue from Springfield Road.
No. 14. Percy Street – Boundary Way (1970s): A barrier closes off Percy Street, it continues at the rear of Ardmoulin Avenue, cuts off the end of Beverley Street, Dover Street and Boundary Street and continues to the junction with Townsend Enterprise Park on the Shankill Road side. It runs at the rear of properties in Finn Square and Finn Court off the Falls Road.

No. 13. Northumberland Street (1970s): Security gates are used to restrict access at certain times. The area between North Howard Street and Northumberland Street is secured by the boundary walls of the Twin Spires Industrial Estate. The area between Northumberland Street and Percy Street is secured by industrial buildings.

No. 12. North Howard Street (1970s): Security gates at North Howard Street are used to restrict access at certain times.

No. 11. Cupar Way (1969): A multi-level fence runs from Lanark Way to the rear of properties at Cupar Street and cuts off access between Cupar Street and Cupar Way. It then runs parallel with Cupar Way to the junction with North Howard Street. The barrier cuts access with Conway Street.

No. 10. Lanark Way (1988): Electronically controlled gates at Lanark Way, between Springfield Road and Merkland Place, can be used to restrict access at certain times.

No. 9. Springfield Road/Workman Avenue (1988-2003): A security wall, with fencing above, runs from Workman Avenue to Lanark Way. It cuts off Woodvale Avenue, Ballensmore Drive, Mountcashel Street and Ainsworth Avenue from Springfield Road.

No. 8. Workman Avenue (1990): A gate with a pedestrian entrance closes off access to Workman Avenue from Springfield Road.

No. 7. Springhill Avenue (1989): A wall with a steel fence in front closes off Springhill Avenue at the junction with Springfield Road, facing New Barnsley PSNI station. The security wall continues the length of Springhill Avenue at the rear of Springhill Heights, Gardens and Close and the rear of Westrock Court. In the other direction from Springhill Avenue a low security wall continues along Springfield Road at the rear of properties on Springhill Crescent.

No. 6. Springmartin Road - Upper Ballygomartin Road (1990 + 1994): A 5 metre high wall and fence runs from the junction of Springfield Road and Springmartin Road, parallel with Springmartin Road until c50 metres from the junction with Ballygomartin Road. There is a substantial buffer zone on either side of the wall. A short return fence runs at right angles to the end of the main barrier, and continues at the rear of houses at Springfield Park as a continuation of the main Springmartin barrier.

No. 5. Moyard (1991): A steel fence 3 metre high runs from the rear of Moyard Parade, across the rear of Moyard Crescent. It continues across the head of Springfield Park and at the rear of houses at Springfield Heights. The fence separates the various properties from rough hillside and grazing land.

No. 4. Kells Avenue, Suffolk (1970s - 2000): A wall and gates close off the junction of Kells Avenue with Stewartstown Road. The barrier has two pedestrian gates and one vehicle gate. This is effectively a continuation of the Oranmore Drive barrier. There is a further security fence along the face of Stewartstown Road in front of two portacabins used by Suffolk Community Services Group, while a wooden fence runs at the rear of the properties on Ringford Crescent. Further security walls and fences protect properties in Lenadoon on the opposite side of Stewartstown Road from close to the Woodburn PSNI station to opposite the library.

No. 3. Oranmore Drive - Malinmore Park, Suffolk A steel fence runs from Blacks Road parallel to Oranmore Drive to the junction with Willowvale Avenue. A second fence runs parallel to this at the rear of Brook Drive and Brook Close and then turns 90 degrees at rear of River Close. A double fence cuts across Willowvale Avenue, across the end of Suffolk Drive to join a fence surrounding the Lidl supermarket on Stewartstown Road.

No. 2. Stewartstown Road, Suffolk (1970s) A short section of fence at the rear of Carnanmore Park and Donegore Gardens. The fence runs from Stewartstown Road (opposite Suffolk Road) to the junction with Blacks Road.

No. 1. Carnanmore Park, Suffolk (1980s): A 2 metre high steel fence runs from the junction of Stewartstown Road between rear of houses in Carnanmore Park and the Glen River. The fence ends abruptly while adjacent path continues.
EXISTING BARRIERS - STAGE ONE
EXISTING BARRIERS - STAGE TWO
EXISTING BARRIERS - STAGE TWO
EXISTING AND PROPOSED BARRIERS - STAGE THREE
EXISTING AND PROPOSED BARRIERS - STAGE THREE
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EXISTING AND PROPOSED BARRIERS - STAGE THREE
PROPOSED BARRIERS - STAGE FOUR
PROPOSED BARRIERS - STAGE FOUR
Catholic houses on the Springfield Road opposite Workman Avenue is a notorious flashpoint during the marching season. The houses are bricked inbetween to stop rioters entering further into the residential area and the front windows removed.¹

A young Protestant family go through the Workman Avenue gate in the peace wall in West Belfast. At night the gates are closed.

1

A peace wall in Townsend Street looking from the Catholic side towards the Shankill Protestant area. This gate is closed at 5.30pm and opened at 7am.¹

¹ Cluan Place, a Protestant area surrounding the Catholic enclave of Short Strand in East Belfast.
A man walks along the interface area and peace wall in Bryson Street dividing the Short Strand area of East Belfast, a Catholic enclave of about 3,500 people in a predominantly Protestant area.
THE WALL: SITE PHOTOS
STRATEGY FOR OCCUPATION: PARCILIZATION + COLLECTIVE FORM
“It will often be part of the architect’s brief to investigate the ‘possibilities’ of a site, in other words to use the ingenuity of the architectural concept to exploit the maximum profit from a piece of land. In the past this would have been considered an immoral use of the talents of an artist. It is now simply part of the sophistication of the whole environmental and building process in which finance can be made into a creative element in design.” Cook, Peter. Architecture: Action and Plan. London: Studio Vista, 1967. Print.

There are 40-50 of separation barriers scattered across Belfast that currently wall off, in, and around bitter conflict zones, dividing up the city’s critical infrastructure. A-typical of the 20th century security wall, the fortification barriers are consumed by inhabited civic infrastructure that press right up to the barrier’s side, making the presence of what many refer to as a “kill zone”, non-existent. The consumption of collision into the wall results in a thickening of the existing perimeters that extend beyond the width of the existing separation barriers to create an integrated network of critical infrastructure shared between the two sides. The following three diagrams trace the extent of one interface wall and the buildings its course comes into contact with. The vacant infrastructure along the course of the wall will be integrated as one sequential system, connected by a series of generative programs that will reshape the existing parameters.

In Maki and Goldberg’s publication, Investigations in Collective Form, the authors state the following:

“(The objective is) to arrange buildings, or parts of multi-use buildings in a sequence of useful activity. Further, to reinforce such a path by any means necessary to propel persons along a general designated path.” Maki, Fumihiko, and Jerry Goldberg. “Investigations in Collective Form.” Linkage in Collective Form. [St. Louis]: Washington University, 1962. 40. Print.

The wall has generated the path, and claimed superiority over everything it has come into contact with, driving out industry, halting critical flows, etc. What becomes critical is the question of whether such an infrastructural device can embed itself within the city more fluidly, taking on sequences of program that will ultimately allow for reappropriation. The wall is an envelope. Everything it envelopes produces collective form. “buildings that have reason to be together...Cities, towns, and villages throughout the world do not lack in rich collections of collective form. Most of them have...simply evolved: they have not been designed.” Collective form adapts to the city around it. It is fluid and forgiving to change. “the ideal is not a system, on the other hand, in which the physical structure of the city is at the mercy of unpredictable change. The ideal is a kind of master form which can move into every new state of equilibrium and yet maintain visual consistency and a sense of continuing order in the long-run.”

The following seven pages exhibit extent of one interface wall and the buildings its course comes into contact with. The vacant infrastructure along the course of the wall will be integrated as one sequential system, connected by a series of generative programs that will reshape the existing parameters.
The wall is an envelope. Everything it envelopes produces collective form.
Site Plan: Interface A
Extent of the peace line wall and all of the buildings along its collision course.
Site Plan: Interface A
Parcilation of site based on Land Ownership
OCCUPIED AND ABANDONED BUILDINGS FALL WITHIN THE INTERFACE

CONGLOMERATION OF PARCELS BETWEEN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT LINES MAKE UP THE ORIGINAL SETTLEMENT FOR THE REOCCUPATION

THE INTERFACE ZONE IS DIVIDED UP INTO PARCELS BASED ON CURRENT LAND OWNERSHIP. SOME PARCELS ARE MORE EASILY AND QUICKLY ATTAINED THAN OTHERS. THE MAJORITY OF BUILDINGS IN THIS ZONE ARE ABANDONED AND/OR BRICKED UP FOR SECURITY REASONS.

SURROUNDING CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT SETTLEMENTS OCCUPY THE PERIPHERY OF THE INTERFACE ON NEIGHBORING PARCELS.
PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION (2.4)
Continuous use of the property – The disseisor must, for statute of limitations purposes, hold that property continuously for the entire limitations period, and use it as a true owner would for that time. This element focuses on adverse possessor’s time on the land, not how long true owner has been dispossessed of it. Occasional activity on the land with long gaps in activity fail the test of continuous possession. Courts have ruled that merely cutting timber at intervals, when not accompanied by other actions that demonstrate actual and continuous possession, fails to demonstrate continuous possession. If the true owner ejects the disseisor from the land, verbally or through legal action, and after some time the disseisor returns and dispossesses him again, then the statute of limitations starts over from the time of the disseisor’s return. He cannot count the time between his ejection by the true property owner and the date on which he returned.

Site Plan: Interface A
Parciliation of site based on Land Ownership.

The following diagram categorizes parcels of land based on ownership, and proposes the best methods for territorial acquisition. The proposal for de-urbanization seeks control of as much interface land as possible so that it may be re-appropriated into collective form.
COMPULSORY PURCHASE FOR HIGHWAYS AND RAILROADS (3.0) The landowner is compensated with a price agreed or stipulated by an appropriate person. Where agreement on price cannot be achieved, the value of the taken land is determined by the Lands Tribunal, a court consisting of one barrister and two chartered surveyors. The operative law is a patchwork of statutes and case law. The principal Acts are the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act 1845, the Land Compensation Act 1961, the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, the Land Compensation Act 1973, the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, part IX of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
ESCHEAT (7.1)  The term is often now applied to the transfer of the title to a person's property to the state when the person dies intestate without any other person capable of taking the property as heir. For example, a common-law jurisdiction's intestacy statute might provide that when someone dies without a will, and is not survived by a spouse, descendants, parents, grandparents, descendants of parents, children or grandchildren of grandparents, or great grandchildren of grandparents, then the person's estate will escheat to the state.
COMPULSORY PURCHASE FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES (3.0) The landowner is compensated with a price agreed or stipulated by an appropriate person. Where agreement on price cannot be achieved, the value of the taken land is determined by the Lands Tribunal, a court consisting of one barrister and two chartered surveyors. The operative law is a patchwork of statutes and case law. The principal Acts are the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act 1845, the Land Compensation Act 1961, the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, the Land Compensation Act 1973, the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, part IX of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION (2.3) Hostile or adverse use of the property – The disseisor entered or used the land without permission. Renters, hunters or others who enter the land with permission are not hostile. The disseisor’s motivations may be viewed by the court in several ways: Objective view—used without true owner’s permission and inconsistent with true owner’s rights. Bad faith or intentional trespass view—used with the adverse possessor’s subjective intent and state of mind (mistaken possession in some jurisdictions does not constitute hostility). Good faith view—a few courts have required that the party mistakenly believed that it is his land. All views require that the disseisor openly claim the land against all possible claims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOT C8</th>
<th>PLOT C18</th>
<th>PLOT C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAR: 1.0</td>
<td>FAR: 0.3</td>
<td>FAR: 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING TYPES: 20% INDUSTRIAL, 54% RESIDENTIAL, 7% COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>BUILDING TYPES: 7% INDUSTRIAL, 50% RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>BUILDING TYPES: 10% INDUSTRIAL, 74% RESIDENTIAL, 7% COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRAISED VALUE: 5.3 MILLION</td>
<td>APPRAISED VALUE: 6.8 MILLION</td>
<td>APPRAISED VALUE: 10.3 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAX: $21,600</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX: $23,000</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX: $24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPANCY: 45%</td>
<td>OCCUPANCY: 49%</td>
<td>OCCUPANCY: 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS: 3-36</td>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS: 21-71</td>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS: 11-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORING PARCELS: P18, 19, 32, C31</td>
<td>NEIGHBORING PARCELS: 16, 30, 37, 38</td>
<td>NEIGHBORING PARCELS: C22, 23, 34, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN, ELECTRICAL GRID</td>
<td>CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN</td>
<td>CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: ELECTRICAL GRID, CITY MAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT ZONE: INTERFACE</td>
<td>CONFLICT ZONE: CATHOLIC</td>
<td>CONFLICT ZONE: PROTESTANT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOT P50</th>
<th>PLOT P52A</th>
<th>PLOT C36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAR: 0.5</td>
<td>FAR: 1.2</td>
<td>FAR: 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING TYPES: 10% INDUSTRIAL, 90% RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>BUILDING TYPES: 2% INDUSTRIAL, 17% COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>BUILDING TYPES: 20% INDUSTRIAL, 74% RESIDENTIAL, 7% COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRAISED VALUE: 7.8 MILLION</td>
<td>APPRAISED VALUE: 7.6 MILLION</td>
<td>APPRAISED VALUE: 10.0 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAX: $23,800</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX: $23,000</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX: $116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPANCY: 68%</td>
<td>OCCUPANCY: 82%</td>
<td>OCCUPANCY: 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS: 21-71</td>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS: 0-44</td>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS: 5-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN, ELECTRICAL GRID</td>
<td>CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN, ELECTRICAL GRID</td>
<td>CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN, ELECTRICAL GRID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT ZONE: PROTESTANT</td>
<td>CONFLICT ZONE: INTERFACE</td>
<td>CONFLICT ZONE: INTERFACE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOT C38</th>
<th>PLOT I3A</th>
<th>PLOT C17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAR: 0.4</td>
<td>FAR: 0.8</td>
<td>FAR: 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING TYPES: 20% INDUSTRIAL, 14% RESIDENTIAL, 17% COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>BUILDING TYPES: 13% INDUSTRIAL, 87% RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>BUILDING TYPES: 10% INDUSTRIAL, 42% RESIDENTIAL, 10% COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRAISED VALUE: 7.6 MILLION</td>
<td>APPRAISED VALUE: 13.4 MILLION</td>
<td>APPRAISED VALUE: 5.6 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAX: $21,600</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX: $23,000</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX: $116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPANCY: 62%</td>
<td>OCCUPANCY: 87%</td>
<td>OCCUPANCY: 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS: 11-69</td>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS: 10-76</td>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS: 10-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORING PARCELS: C22, 23, 25, 26, 37, 38</td>
<td>NEIGHBORING PARCELS: 14, 23, 45, P38</td>
<td>NEIGHBORING PARCELS: 14, 23, 34, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN, ELECTRICAL GRID, CITY MAIN</td>
<td>CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: ELECTRICAL GRID, CITY MAIN</td>
<td>CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: ELECTRICAL GRID, CITY MAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES</td>
<td>ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT ZONE: INTERFACE</td>
<td>CONFLICT ZONE: INTERFACE</td>
<td>CONFLICT ZONE: INTERFACE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION

(2.0) Actual possession of the property – The disseisor must physically use the land as a property owner would, in accordance with the type of property, location, and uses. Merely walking or hunting on land does not establish actual possession. In Cone v. West Virginia Pulp & Paper, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit held that Cone failed to establish actual possession by occasionally visiting the land and hunting on it, because his actions did not change the state of the land, as by clearing, mowing, planting, harvesting fruit of the land, logging or cutting timber, mining, fencing, pulling tree stumps, running livestock and constructing buildings or other improvements.

(7.0) ESCHATE (7.0) if a person is made bankrupt or a corporation is liquidated. Usually this means that all the property held by that person is ‘vested in’ (transferred to) the Official Receiver or Trustee in Bankruptcy.
PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION (2.0) Actual possession of the property – The disseisor must physically use the land as a property owner would, in accordance with the type of property, location, and uses. Merely walking or hunting on land does not establish actual possession. In Cone v. West Virginia Pulp & Paper, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit held that Cone failed to establish actual possession by occasionally visiting the land and hunting on it, because his actions did not change the land from a wild and natural state. The actions of the disseisor must change the state of the land, as by clearing, mowing, planting, harvesting fruit of the land, logging or cutting timber, mining, fencing, pulling tree stumps, running livestock and constructing buildings or other improvements.
PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION (2.3) Hostile or adverse use of the property - The disseisor entered or used the land without permission. Renters, hunters or others who enter the land with permission are not hostile. The disseisor’s motivations may be viewed by the court in several ways: Objective view—used without true owner’s permission and inconsistent with true owner’s rights. Bad faith or intentional trespass view—used with the adverse possessor’s subjective intent and state of mind (mistaken possession in some jurisdictions does not constitute hostility). Good faith view—a few courts have required that the party mistakenly believed that it is his land. All views require that the disseisor openly claim the land against all possible claims.

PLOT C28
FAR: 0.7
BUILDING TYPES: 13% INDUSTRIAL, 76% RESIDENTIAL, 7% COMMERCIAL
DATES CONSTRUCTED: 1946 - 1993
APPRaised VALUE: $135.0 MILLION
PROPERTY NO: 271.000
OCCUPANCY: 44%
DEMographics: 2-4
NEIGHBORING PARCELS: 32, 29, 34, 41
CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN, ELECTRICAL GRID
ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES
COMPACT ZONE: INTERFACE

PLOT C13
FAR: 2.3
BUILDING TYPES: 15% INDUSTRIAL, 74% RESIDENTIAL, 7% COMMERCIAL
DATES CONSTRUCTED: 1946 - 1993
APPRaised VALUE: $215.0 MILLION
PROPERTY NO: 5.014
OCCUPANCY: 80%
DEMographics: 2-60
NEIGHBORING PARCELS: 23, 29, 34, 41
CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN, ELECTRICAL GRID
ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: NO
CONFLICT ZONE: CATHOLIC

PLOT I19
FAR: 1.0
BUILDING TYPES: 43% INDUSTRIAL, 27% RESIDENTIAL, 30% COMMERCIAL
DATES CONSTRUCTED: 1928 - 1971
APPRaised VALUE: $15.0 MILLION
PROPERTY NO: 230.000
OCCUPANCY: 45%
DEMographics: 10-56
NEIGHBORING PARCELS: 14, 28, 49
ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES
COMPACT ZONE: INTERFACE ZONE

PLOT I9
FAR: 1.0
BUILDING TYPES: 55% INDUSTRIAL, 35% RESIDENTIAL, 10% COMMERCIAL
DATES CONSTRUCTED: 1954 - 1993
APPRaised VALUE: $118.0 MILLION
PROPERTY NO: 235.000
OCCUPANCY: 76%
DEMographics: 10-56
NEIGHBORING PARCELS: 30, 39, 42, 64
CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN, ELECTRICAL GRID
ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES
COMPACT ZONE: INTERFACE

PLOT I9A
FAR: 2.2
BUILDING TYPES: 15% INDUSTRIAL, 85% RESIDENTIAL, 2% COMMERCIAL
DATES CONSTRUCTED: 1996 - 2001
APPRaised VALUE: $193.0 MILLION
PROPERTY NO: 718.000
OCCUPANCY: 65%
DEMographics: 2-58
CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: CITY MAIN, ELECTRICAL GRID
ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: YES
COMPACT ZONE: INTERFACE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOT</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>BUILDING TYPES</th>
<th>Dates Constructed</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Property Tax</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Neighboring Parcels</th>
<th>Critical Infrastructure</th>
<th>Eligibility for Purchase</th>
<th>Conflict Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I22B</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>25% Industrial, 24% Residential, 26% Commercial</td>
<td>1894 - 1909</td>
<td>$7.6 Million</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>35-55</td>
<td>13, 24, 26, 36</td>
<td>Electrical Grid, City Main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32% Industrial, 67% Residential</td>
<td>1818 - 1927</td>
<td>$10.6 Million</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26-76</td>
<td>15, 26, 47</td>
<td>Electrical Grid, City Main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I18</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>13% Industrial, 87% Residential</td>
<td>1968 - 1977</td>
<td>$12.6 Million</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>29-76</td>
<td>22, 29, 46, 47</td>
<td>Electrical Grid, City Main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10% Industrial, 90% Residential</td>
<td>1898 - 1923</td>
<td>$6.6 Million</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10-76</td>
<td>14, 28, 45</td>
<td>Electrical Grid, City Main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>30% Industrial, 40% Residential, 30% Commercial</td>
<td>1916 - 2006</td>
<td>$10 Million</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2-51</td>
<td>3, 10, 12, C12</td>
<td>Electrical Grid, City Main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Interface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESCHEAT (7.0)**: If a person is made bankrupt or a corporation is liquidated, usually this means that all the property held by that person is vested in/ transferred to the Official Receiver or Trustee in Bankruptcy.
PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION (2.2) Exclusive use of the property – The disseisor holds the land to the exclusion of the true owner. If, for example, the disseisor builds a barn on the owner’s property, and the owner then uses the barn, the disseisor cannot claim exclusive use. (Note: There may be more than one adverse possessor, taking as tenants in common, as long as all other elements are met.)
**PLOT C22**

- **FAR:** 2.0
- **Building Types:** 13% Industrial, 83% Residential
- **Dates Constructed:** 1856 - 1967
- **Appraised Value:** $8.0 Million
- **Property Tax:** $88,000
- **Occupancy:** 45%
- **Demographics:** 10-76
- **Neighboring Parcels:** 14, 26, 27
- **Compact Zone:** Interface Zone

**PLOT I7**

- **FAR:** 0.4
- **Building Types:** 26% Industrial, 74% Residential
- **Dates Constructed:** 1874 - 1898
- **Appraised Value:** $10.4 Million
- **Property Tax:** $107,000
- **Occupancy:** 25%
- **Demographics:** 1-14
- **Neighboring Parcels:** 21, 25, 37, 39
- **Compact Zone:** Interface Zone

**PLOT I2**

- **FAR:** 0.8
- **Building Types:** 13% Industrial, 87% Residential
- **Dates Constructed:** 1858 - 1967
- **Appraised Value:** $9.6 Million
- **Property Tax:** $66,000
- **Occupancy:** 45%
- **Demographics:** 10-76
- **Neighboring Parcels:** 14, 28, 45
- **Compact Zone:** Interface Zone

**PLOT C34**

- **FAR:** 0.8
- **Building Types:** 33% Industrial, 67% Residential
- **Dates Constructed:** 1818 - 1927
- **Appraised Value:** $10.6 Million
- **Property Tax:** $76,000
- **Occupancy:** 67%
- **Demographics:** 26-76
- **Neighboring Parcels:** 15, 26, 47
- **CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE:** Electrical Grid, City Main
- **ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE:** Yes
- **CONFLICT ZONE:** Catholic

**PLOT P16**

- **FAR:** 1.1
- **Building Types:** 25% Industrial, 54% Residential, 21% Commercial
- **Dates Constructed:** 1854 - 1893
- **Appraised Value:** $5.3 Million
- **Property Tax:** $56,000
- **Occupancy:** 25%
- **Demographics:** 5-21
- **CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE:** Electrical Grid, City Main
- **ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE:** Yes
- **COMPACT ZONE:** Interface

**PLOT I6A**

- **FAR:** 1.3
- **Building Types:** 43% Industrial, 54% Residential, 5% Commercial
- **Dates Constructed:** 1926 - 1953
- **Appraised Value:** $5.8 Million
- **Property Tax:** $59,000
- **Occupancy:** 19%
- **Demographics:** 19-53
- **Neighboring Parcels:** 21, 25, 37, 38
- **CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE:** Electrical Grid, City Main
- **ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE:** Yes
- **COMPACT ZONE:** Interface

**PLOT P54**

- **FAR:** 1.3
- **Building Types:** 25% Industrial, 17% Commercial, 58% Residential
- **Dates Constructed:** 1894 - 1963
- **Appraised Value:** $7.0 Million
- **Property Tax:** $78,000
- **Occupancy:** 50%
- **Demographics:** 5-50
- **Neighboring Parcels:** 21, 25, 37, 38
- **CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE:** Electrical Grid, City Main
- **ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE:** Yes
- **COMPACT ZONE:** Protestant

**PLOT C36A**

- **FAR:** 0.4
- **Building Types:** 29% Industrial, 74% Residential, 17% Commercial
- **Dates Constructed:** 1848 - 1923
- **Appraised Value:** $4.6 Million
- **Property Tax:** $36,000
- **Occupancy:** 49%
- **Demographics:** 32-76
- **Neighboring Parcels:** 19, 26, 27, 37
- **CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE:** City Main
- **ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE:** Yes
- **CONFLICT ZONE:** Catholic

**PLOT C34A**

- **FAR:** 2.2
- **Building Types:** 75% Industrial, 22% Residential
- **Dates Constructed:** 1879 - 1905
- **Appraised Value:** $7.8 Million
- **Property Tax:** $54,000
- **Occupancy:** 25%
- **Demographics:** 0-75
- **Neighboring Parcels:** 21, 25, 37, 38
- **CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE:** Electrical Grid, City Main
- **ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE:** Yes
- **COMPACT ZONE:** Interface

**PLOT C25**

- **FAR:** 3.5
- **Building Types:** 7% Industrial, 93% Residential
- **Dates Constructed:** 1924 - 1927
- **Appraised Value:** $2.2 Million
- **Property Tax:** $25,000
- **Occupancy:** 15%
- **Demographics:** 0-93
- **Neighboring Parcels:** 21, 25, 37, 38
- **CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE:** Electrical Grid, City Main
- **ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE:** No
- **CONFLICT ZONE:** Catholic
“Since line-dwellers are already less mobile than their middle-class neighbours, putting up fences (real or imagined) distorts the markets for labour, property, goods and services. Catholic areas of Belfast tend to be overcrowded, while many Protestant blocks lie derelict.” - The Economist. July 14th 2011
SITE PARCELS AND WALL OPERATIONS

PLOT C08|C12|12-4|P14

- BUILDING TYPES: 31% RESIDENTIAL, 45% INDUSTRIAL, 4% COMMERCIAL
- DATES CONSTRUCTED: 1854-1987
- APPRAISED VALUE: $222,000
- PROPERTY: 80 X 150
- ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: 65% LOT UP FOR PURCHASE
- NEIGHBORING PARCELS: C9, 24, I11, I114, P34, P35
- DEMOGRAPHICS: 11-55
- PROPERTY TAX: $222,000
- DATES CONSTRUCTED: 1854-1987
- BUILDING TYPES: 71% RESIDENITIAL, 25% INDUSTRIAL, 4% COMMERCIAL
- FAR: 0.4
- CONFLICT ZONE: EXTREME INTERFACE
- CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: ELECTRIAL AND SEWARE SYSTEM
- OCCUPANCY: 53%

PLOT C22|C24|17-10|P38

- BUILDING TYPES: 71% RESIDENTIAL, 25% INDUSTRIAL, 4% COMMERCIAL
- DATES CONSTRUCTED: 1954-1987
- APPRAISED VALUE: 126 MILLION
- PROPERTY: 80 X 150
- ELIGIBILITY FOR PURCHASE: 45% LOT UP FOR PURCHASE
- NEIGHBORING PARCELS: C7, 14, I21, I114, P34, P35
- PROPERTY TAX: $202,000
- DATES CONSTRUCTED: 1954-1987
- BUILDING TYPES: 51% RESIDENITIAL, 45% INDUSTRIAL, 4% COMMERCIAL
- FAR: 0.35
- CONFLICT ZONE: EXTREME INTERFACE
- CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: ELECTRIAL AND SEWARE SYSTEM
- OCCUPANCY: 63%

PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH PURCHASE OF SALE (1) PURCHASE OF ALL

PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION (2.0) Actual

PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH PURCHASE OF SALE (1) PURCHASE OF ALL

PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION (2.0) Actual

PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH PURCHASE OF SALE (1) PURCHASE OF ALL

PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION (2.0) Actual
PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH ADVERSE POSSESSION (2.4) Continuous use of the property – The disseisor must, for statute of limitations purposes, hold that property continuously for the entire limitations period, and use it as a true owner would for that time. This element focuses on adverse possessor’s time on the land, not how long true owner has been dispossessed of it. Occasional activity on the land with long gaps in activity fail the test of continuous possession. Courts have ruled that merely cutting timber at intervals, when not accompanied by other actions that demonstrate actual and continuous possession, fails to demonstrate continuous possession. If the true owner ejects the disseisor from the land, verbally or through legal action, and after some time the disseisor returns and dispossesses him again, then the statute of limitation starts over from the time of the disseisor’s return. He cannot count the time between his ejection by the true property owner and the date on which he returned.

COMPULSORY PURCHASE FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES (3.0) The landowner is compensated with a price agreed or stipulated by an appropriate person. Where agreement on price cannot be achieved, the value of the taken land is determined by the Lands Tribunal, a court consisting of one barrister and two chartered surveyors. The operative law is a patchwork of statutes and case law. The principal Acts are the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act 1845, the Land Compensation Act 1961, the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, the Land Compensation Act 1973, the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, part IX of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

PROPERTY ACQUISITION THROUGH PURCHASE OF SALE (1) PURCHASE OF ALL PRIVATE PROPERTY WITHIN AND AROUND INTERFACE ZONE AREA EXTENDING OUTWARD OF 50 METERS.

COMPULSORY PURCHASE FOR PUBLIC SAFETY (3.0) The landowner is compensated with a price agreed or stipulated by an appropriate person. Where agreement on price cannot be achieved, the value of the taken land is determined by the Lands Tribunal, a court consisting of one barrister and two chartered surveyors. The operative law is a patchwork of statutes and case law. The principal Acts are the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act 1845, the Land Compensation Act 1961, the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, the Land Compensation Act 1973, the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, part IX of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
BUILDING CASE STUDY A: PLANS
BUILDING CASE STUDY A : LATERAL SECTION
BUILDING CASE STUDY A: LATERAL SECTION
FINAL REVIEW
OF THE METROPOLITAN WALL
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RE-APPROPRIATING EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE*


Lynch, Kevin. “The Nature of City Form” and “Is a General Normative Theory Possibly?” (drafts)


Maki, Fumihiko, and Jerry Goldberg. “Investigations in Collective Form.” Linkage in Collective Form. [St. Louis]: Wash


Worthington, G. Interview by Scott A. Bollens. Print.


