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This thesis began with the attitude that American suburban neighborhoods have some positive qualities. However, the character of these neighborhoods is changing; it is no longer economically feasible for each family to own its own home, and increasing awareness of land conservation is causing neighborhoods to consolidate. As these neighborhoods become denser it is important that they retain their original character.

This thesis is a design exploration for a denser housing prototype on a vacant block in Inman Park, one of Atlanta's original suburbs, which was built at the turn-of-the-century. The attempt was to retain the character of the neighborhood at the street, while adding density to the interior parts of the site. A cluster prototype was developed using the scale and character of the existing buildings. Public access through the site, relationships between the outdoor spaces and their public or private nature, and relationships between open spaces all became important aspects in the design process.
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INTRODUCTION

IMAGE

"Suburban imagery is familiar to us all, as American as apple pie, as English as a pint of bitter."

- Robert Stern,
The Anglo American Suburb

Suburbs have been a part of our culture since the merchant class became able to build in the country. These early suburbs, based upon images of wealthy country estates, bring to mind Lutyen's country houses, romantic landscapes, and tailored gardens. The houses of many American suburbs are derived from these same English country house types. This image of house and garden was a major influence on the design.
COMMUNITY

"When the stranger says 'What is the meaning of this city? Do you huddle together because you love each other'? What will you answer 'We all dwell together to make money from each other,' or 'This is a community,' - T.S. Eliot "The Rock"

Suburbs do differ from the estate, in that they also have the image of a community. This sense of community, sense of place, was also a major influence on my design.
The history and development of the suburb has been well documented and studied and elaboration on this subject has little to do with the following design. The more recent suburbs have been designed for much denser housing. As less land becomes available for development, conservation becomes a more important issue. Architects are presently facing the problem of how to increase density in existing suburbs rather than designing completely new suburbs. In the following design, understanding the existing fabric is all important. Finding a way to increase the density without destroying the character of the place became a third major influence on the design.
THE SITE

CHARACTER

Most design projects begin with a site. This project is no different in that sense; the site was the beginning point. The site was chosen for two reasons. The first was a personal one. Having lived in the neighborhood of the site for over two years, I developed an attitude toward the site and toward what types of buildings should be built there. Inman Park has a well organized community group, of which I felt a part of. This group is quite outspoken regarding the preservation of neighborhood character, and I am in full agreement with them. They oppose any high rise construction in the area and prefer that most buildings be in keeping with the scale of the existing residences. They prefer residential construction over any other; they also prefer that a major portion of the land be left unpaved to preserve the green, country character of the area.
CONTROVERSY

The second reason for choosing this site has to do with a recent controversy. The site is part of a larger piece of land that has been dubbed "The Great Park". In the early 60's this land was purchased by the Georgia Department of Transportation (DOT) in order to build a proposed connector route for I-485. At the time of the purchase, the land was inexpensive; the neighborhoods were in a state of decline because the middle class residents had moved out to new suburbs and most of the residence were transient types, not staying long enough to oppose the purchase. However some residents opposed the connector route and after many years of political volleying, between the city of Atlanta and D.O.T., the decision was made that the connector route was not necessary and would not be built. In the meantime, the neighborhoods experienced a renaissance. Families moved back in and renovated old houses. Other people subdivided larger houses into smaller apartments. New, denser housing was built on vacant land. All of this is still going on. The value of the property in these neighborhoods has skyrocketed. The Great Park is currently the largest area of vacant land within a major metropolitan area in the United States. The issue of how to develop the land is problematic for D.O.T. and Atlanta.
THE GREAT PARK AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO DOWNTOWN ATLANTA
In my research I found two official studies compiled of the Great Park. One, funded by the city was completed by Architect Randall Roark. The Great Park is a cruciform shaped piece of land that cuts through four different neighborhoods. Roark studied in detail the character and density of these neighborhoods. In his proposal he recommended using the building prototypes that exist in the neighborhoods, but proposed ways of subdividing these into more dwellings. Although this proposal is sensitive to the existing fabric it does not increase the density enough to meet the demands for in-town housing. It also offers no new communal areas.

The second study was the result of a competition sponsored by D.O.T. The winning entry, by Portman and Associates, proposed a large "international center" in the middle of the Great Park, with high rise towers and midrise apartments in the four arms (amongst the quaint Victorian cottages). Although this proposal meets new density demands, it is completely insensitive to the existing fabric. This proposal has a communal area but it is too large and expansive to offer any real sense of community.

A sensible proposal for the Great Park would follow guidelines similar to those proposed by Roark, but develop a denser typology. It was my intention to study such a typology in detail. In order to do this I have designed only a small piece of land in the southeast arm of the Great Park. This piece was chosen because of its proximity to the transit station, and because its architectural character makes it the most significant of the four neighborhoods.
EXISTING CHARACTERISTICS

LOT SIZE  DENSITY  UNIT SIZE

PROPOSED CHARACTERISTICS  STYLE VARIATIONS

TRIPLEX - owner

QUADRUPLEX

SIXPLEX - own or rent

STYLE VARIATIONS
Inman Park is one of Atlanta's oldest neighborhoods. It was built originally as a commuter suburb, having electric cable cars connecting it to town. Today the old carriage house of the original cable car station is still standing and is only a block away from the new MARTA train station. Also still standing are many of the large houses, two of which, the Candler and Hurt houses have been recently restored. Most of the large houses are from the turn-of-the-century, however many of the houses were built in the 20's and 30's after the wealthy had moved out. These houses were built by middle class citizens and were much more modest. They could be best categorized as bungalows or cottages. Even though these houses were not as grand, the character of the tree lined streets and manicured lawns remained the same.

Although recently some unsightly apartments have blemished the neighborhood, Inman Park's character is still mostly intact.
THE OLD CARRAGE HOUSE FOR THE ORIGINAL CABLE CAR STATION

THE NEW MARTA (METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY) STATION
BUNGALOWS, BUILT IN THE 1930’S, EDGEWOOD AVENUE

SPRINGVALE PARK FROM EUCLID AVENUE
COMMUNITY/DENSITY

The streets of Inman Park are not only important for their imagery, but they also tie the neighborhood together as a community. The streets and sidewalks are the communal area for the block. It is the place where people meet their neighbors. As the neighborhood grows denser and more housing is added to the interior of the block, the street functions as a communal area only for those dwellings that have direct frontage to it. This growth pattern isolates the new housing, giving the residents no communal areas. In order for the residents to feel that they are a part of something greater than the building in which they live, some outdoor communal area is needed.
"Cluster implies community, individuals living in a common location. Community requires a certain density, order and beauty, and should be a source of pride." - Untermann

The decision to use a cluster type housing in the following scheme was an attempt to give the dwellings a new communal area. The dwellings fronting the street can still relate to the street in the same way that the existing houses do, but the dwellings to the rear need something else. Since this area is behind other dwellings, it has taken the form of a shared garden. The type of cluster developed here can be thought of in two ways: as a group of houses pulled together to form an enclosure, or as a 'U' shaped courtyard building that has been pulled apart for more accessability. In either line of thought, the form of the whole is as important as the form of the individual dwellings.
YARDS

The formation of the cluster also adds definition to the backyard spaces. In the existing houses that have more than one dwelling, the backyard is either vacated and used only as a junkyard, or it is divided up with fences defining ownership.

To emphasize the suburban image of the cluster, it was important that more of the land area be unpaved. The unpaved area has many forms, shared gardens, landscaped lawns and private yards.
"People like to fence their gardens to maintain privacy, to define their territory and to protect and restrict their children." - Untermann

In this design it was important to give the residents the option of fencing their yards which are already partially defined by low retaining walls and terrace edges.

"Private suburban gardens are large enough to allow some sunshine regardless of the yard orientation. On the other hand since the garden of a medium density housing development is smaller and shadowed by two to four story buildings nearby, it must be perfectly oriented.

- Untermann

No yards in this design are positioned on the north side of the building. Minimal dimensions between the buildings were determined so that all dwellings could have direct sunlight. This dimension was worked out in section, taking into account the slope of the land. The clusters and buildings were designed to step up with the land slope of 10%. Without this terracing the clusters would be isolated from one another by large retaining walls, and the yards would be in shadows."
A typical section through a block in Inman Park reveals a definite ordering system for the types of spaces within the houses and their yards. This system was respected with regard to the front layers of the cluster designs. It also greatly influenced the dwelling designs specifically.
INTERIOR CLUSTER SECTION
ROOMS
The layering of spaces implied definite room types that existed in the older houses of Inman Park. It was important to offer these same types of rooms in the new dwellings. The front porch is one of the most important of these rooms. I call it a room, because it should be spatial and not merely a formal layer between facade and street. It is a place in which people sit during the evening talking to their neighbors and watching the street. It was important to provide some type of porch even for the dwellings that did not face the street directly. These porches which do not face the street, I have called verandas. The depth of the porch or veranda is important not only for the provision of sitting room, but also for the provision of privacy for the front formal rooms.
LIVING ROOMS

It was important to provide both a living room and a family room in each dwelling. These rooms have different characters.

A living room is always behind the porch or veranda. It is generally of the north side of the dwelling. It is formal, but welcoming, has a fireplace and is the quiet center of the dwelling.

Landscape Gardening published in 1816, illustrated an old fashioned 'Cedar Parlour' and a modern 'Living Room' (Pls 148 and 149). He wrote a poem to go with the pictures:

No more the cedar parlour's formal gloom
With dulness chills, 'tis now the living room,
Where guests to whim, to task or fancy true

from LIFE IN THE ENGLISH COUNTRY HOUSE
FORMAL, WARM LIVING ROOMS
FAMILY ROOMS

INFORMAL ATMOSPHERE
The family room is open to the kitchen and dining area. It is the center of activity for the dwelling. It is usually on the sunny side and has access to a terrace and yard or deck. In this area, an open plan has been used in a way that permits the owners to enclose smaller areas if they desire.
OUTDOOR ROOMS

The provision of "outdoor rooms" was also important, since the dwellings are in a warm weather climate zone. The "outdoor rooms" stem from the tradition of back screened porches. They are often used for dining, so they are located close to the kitchens. They provide a feeling of being outdoors, without the bother of insects or inclement weather. The "outdoor rooms" are on the sunny side of the dwelling and are mostly glazed, however the windows are all operable so that when they are open the room is very much like a screened porch.
Bedrooms

Most of the dwellings are two floors in height, and as is typical of the houses in Inman Park, the bedrooms are on the second floor. This maximizes their privacy. The dwellings vary in sizes from 950 square feet to 1350 square feet. They contain from one to three bedrooms.
The scale of the buildings in the design are in keeping with the scale of the existing neighborhood buildings. The intent was also to have a similar character.

The roofscape of the neighborhood is a collage of sloped roofs and chimneys. Sloped roofs are typical of construction in this area and was respected in the design. However, looking at the houses individually, one usually finds a hipped roof, symbolic of their original single family usage. Since the new buildings contain more than one dwelling, gable roofs were used, expressing the additive nature of the buildings, and the multiplicity of dwellings.
"It is essential for units to have privacy and identity at the entrance."
- Untermann

The entrances to all of the dwellings are marked by an arch. This arch leads onto the porch and is aligned with the front door. The porch provides privacy and protection from the weather, as well as a place for people to display items of identity, expressing their individual taste.
The typical windows in the neighborhood are long in proportion and usually double or single hung. A two foot, six inch module was established for the window sizes. The small size was expressive of the domestic nature of the buildings. Square windows were used in bathrooms. Double length windows, in the form of a double hung window were used in bedrooms and living areas that did not open to a deck or a porch. Where these rooms opened to a porch or a deck, a triple length window was used, either in the form of a french door or a triple hung window. A triple hung window with a sill level even with the floor is a typical detail used in old southern houses. These windows usually open to a porch. In the hot, humid, summer the cooler air settles to the floor of the porch. These windows help to circulate this cooler air into the dwelling.
A variety of materials can be found in Inman Park. Clapboard siding is typical of the area and was adapted for the buildings, using similar wood detailing as well. The buildings sit on brick foundations and have private sidewalks and low retaining walls of brick, blending with the new transit (MARTA) station south of the site. The street sidewalks and public pedestrian walks are made of concrete hexagonal blocks that are abundant in Atlanta's neighborhoods.
WOOD CLAPBOARD HOUSE ON HURT STREET
BUILDINGS

Each cluster has three types of buildings. These types although mostly determined by the form of the cluster described earlier, are partially derived from growth patterns existing in the neighborhood. I refer to these types of buildings as the front, rear, and side buildings.
The front building faces the street directly and is like a typical house that has been subdivided into smaller dwellings. However, it was important to provide separate porches and entrances for these dwellings. When this building is in the interior of the site, the porches become verandas and the entrances are less formal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRIVATE 1st FL</th>
<th>PRIVATE 2nd FL</th>
<th>PUBLIC 1st FL</th>
<th>PUBLIC 2nd FL</th>
<th>VERTICAL ACCESS</th>
<th>YARD</th>
<th>PUBLIC ACCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>room layers - front building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIVATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Yard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Rooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Rooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porch or Veranda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Yard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Garden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sidewalk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52
FRONT BUILDING

first floor

second floor

third floor

section

DWELLING 1

DWELLING 2

DWELLING 3
REAR BUILDING

The rear building faces the shared garden and is in part patterned after the carriage houses that now contain one or more individual dwellings. The dwellings in the rear building have their own veranda and entrance. These entrances are less formal than the front building. The spaces have a less traditional layout than those in the front building.
room layers - rear building
REAR BUILDING

first floor

second floor

section

DWELLING 1

DWELLING 2

DWELLING 3
SIDE BUILDING

The side building is patterned after small houses that have several additional dwellings attached to the rear. The dwellings in the side building have verandas and entrances that are off of the path that leads to the shared garden and rear building. A front dwelling enters off of the street with its own front porch. Because this building is longer than the other buildings, it became important to provide access through it. This access path connects the cluster with the parking for the rear and side buildings. The side building sometimes sits on the corner. When it does the verandas become porches facing the street and the backyards face the interior of the cluster.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC ACCESS</th>
<th>VERANDA</th>
<th>FORMAL ROOMS</th>
<th>VERTICAL ACCESS</th>
<th>INFORMAL ROOMS</th>
<th>OUTDOOR ROOMS</th>
<th>PRIVATE YARDS</th>
<th>PARKING COURT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRIVATE YARDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC 1st FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRIVATE 2nd FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HEARTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC 1st FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRIVATE 2nd FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC ACCESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC 1st FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRIVATE 2nd FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HEARTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC 1st FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRIVATE 2nd FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PORCH or VERANDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FRONT YARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*room layers—side building*
In the design, there are three different prototypical clusters. The first and most common I have called the "street cluster." This cluster faces the street directly. The dwellings with direct frontage have front porches and entrances like the existing houses. The other dwellings either enter along the edges of the shared garden, which is connected to the street and to parking by paved walks.
shared area

STREET CLUSTER
STREET CLUSTER
The second type of cluster I have called the "corner cluster", and as the name implies, it is on the street corner. Its building/outdoor space relationships are similar to those of the street cluster. Because it sits on a corner the cluster has two "fronts" and therefore more entrances with direct access. The shared garden has fewer entrances and accesses from both the streets.
CORNER CLUSTER

auto access
pedestrian access
entrance
building
INTERIOR CLUSTER

Both of the above described clusters have the 'U' shape with one side toward the street. The third type of cluster is opened toward the street, however it is quite a distance from the street and is not directly connected with it. I have called this cluster the "interior cluster." It is more open than the other clusters because of its distance from the street. It has pedestrian access to the street, to parking, and to the other clusters.
CLUSTER RELATIONSHIPS

Two types of spaces occur between the cluster. A shared parking area is one of these types of spaces. In the area the cars are parked in groups of two and three, so that their total dimensional presence is smaller than any building dimension. There are areas between the parking spaces for plants and trees and there are plant covered trellises over the parking spaces. The parking area appears more green and soft rather than paved and harsh.

The other type of space between the clusters is a garden or lawn. The character of this spaces is similar to the shared garden except that it is more open and more formal. It is a more tranquil space because there are fewer or no entrances to it. It was important to have pedestrian connections between the clusters through these spaces.
The social/communal aspects of the cluster were instrumental in the development of the form of the cluster. However, the following general site characteristics were also used to develop the form of the cluster: land slope, solar access, and street orientation. When applying the clusters to the site, specific site characteristics had to be taken into consideration.

Of first importance was preserving the arc of Poplar Circle which cuts through the site, and turning the oval piece of land into a small park. This continues the tradition of small parks surrounded by houses that exist in Atlanta neighborhoods.
GROVE OF TREES AT THE ARC OF POPLAR CIRCLE
Public pedestrian connections were another major consideration in site planning. A primary pedestrian connection from the MARTA station to Euclid Avenue toward the commercial center was needed. At present there is a foot path worn across the site along this route. A secondary path was also needed to connect this primary path with the new park. This secondary path divides the site into two areas each containing four clusters. The area that this path cuts through is the largest open area on the site and with its connections to the park, it brings the character of the park into the site.

The south edge of the site faces the MARTA parking lot. The back edge of this lot has been adapted for parking for the dwellings near this edge. This parking is trellised and green like the parking clusters and it provides a buffer between the parking lot and private yards.
The density of Inman Park ranges from two to six dwellings per acre. My original goal was to increase this density to ten to fifteen dwellings per acre. The site is six acres and the final site plan contains eighty dwellings; this gives a density of a little over thirteen dwellings per acre. In addition to this goal was the effort to retain the character of the neighborhood. The tree-lined streets, the scale of the buildings and the rhythm of the front porches has helped the design succeed in this effort.

Other goals of establishing new communal areas that work cannot be evaluated without being built and tested. Whether the form of the cluster with a shared garden space would help to give a real sense of community to the group cannot be determined by what has been done in this thesis. Perhaps it would be best to conclude by saying that if this thesis were to continue it would be helpful to study other forms of cluster housing that offer communal areas, and compare the differences.
END OF THE ROAD?
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