



REPORT



What → Workshop

When → 28/8/2020

Where → Level Five

Who → Architects: Thomas Rigby, Maxime Czvek,
Laura Muldermans, Aurélie Hachez.
Partners: Level Five, Globe Aroma, VUB,
CLTB.

Program and areas description

For each of the partners we have listed the spaces and the related areas in an overview sheet. The netto (measured between the interior walls of the spaces) and the bruto (taken all circulation, technical spaces, inner and outer walls, ...in account) areas are calculated. The factor from the netto to bruto in between 1.3 and 1.6 is a rule of thumb and needs further refinement (as it changes in function of the type of intervention) and to be precised in the development of the program. For each of the partners we ask to review the numbers, add potential missing spaces and give more explanation in terms of surfaces, dimensions, and conditions for each space. For further precisions, see below within the “Homework” paragraph.

Program challenges

A. Common areas

We envision 3 scales of common spaces that will have to be better defined within the process. Here are the different categories we summarized following our discussions during the workshop.

1. Facilities for the whole building + accessible for public

Spaces shared between the partners and the community (neighbourhood and city). These kinds of spaces are accessible and visible from the outside and they represent/manifest the complexity and diversity of programs and activities on site. These spaces are predominantly located on the ground floor to ease the access and use of the facilities but they could also be located on the top floors to avoid the system of divided blocs (public plinth and private floors above). The position of some public facilities could also be driven by the existing facilities in the building, such as the Auditorium or the gym in order to take full advantage of the existing structures.

- ✓ Forum
- ✓ Cafeteria
- ✓ External spaces
- ✓ Auditorium
- ✓ Sport Facilities

2. Shared spaces in between partners

Spaces shared between one or two partners (or between all if needed).

- ✓ Production spaces
- ✓ Quiet desk space
- ✓ Kitchen
- ✓ Ressourceries / Recyclerie
- ✓ Exhibition spaces
- ✓ Rehearsal space
- ✓ Chill spaces / smaller bar

We envision this type of spaces at a scale that fits to the users. The principles of how to define the sharing spaces could be based on:

- Similar use / Similar practice (Production spaces, Artist studios, Exhibition Spaces,.)
- Equivalent needs (Kitchen, Toilets/showers, cleaning areas, “ressourceries”)
- Different temporality of use (During the day/nightevening/week-end)

3. Private common spaces shared among one party

Spaces that are more private or that are prerogative to each actor.

They are shared among one function.

- ✓ Specific offices;
- ✓ Laundry rooms for housing;
- ✓ Smaller kitchen ?;
- ✓ Private chill spaces for Globe Aroma?

4. Individual spaces

Spaces that each party needs for their own functioning.

- ✓ Specific offices (Globe Aroma, VUB –Cosmopolis)
- ✓ Apartments (Housing)
- ✓ Private artist studios + shared desk space (Level Five);

B. Scale of the project

Calculation of the sqm of the total building and comparison with the final program established during the workshop, showed an average of an extra 5000sqm available.

1. Extra sqm

What is the best strategy to fill up these extra areas? Here are some propositions that will have to be tested in further researches:

- Demolition of some part of the building for a better use of the spatiality?
- Bigger part given to housing in order to finance the project
- Political strategy of adding extra facilities to be used for the neighbourhood.
 - ✓ Crèche;
 - ✓ Salle de quartier,



2. Underground areas

What should be the role of the underground that represent also an important part of the building (6000 extra sqm)? Needs of parking spaces for each function will have to be critically analysed and maybe countered with other possible strategic uses of the space:

- ✓ Rehearsal studios
- ✓ Storages for artist studios;
- ✓ Basement for housing
- ✓ Functions that can be noisy (Sound studios, etc.)
- ✓ Parking for neighbourhood (so less cars on the street)

First spatial intentions

During the workshop, we have gathered some first spatial intentions that will have to be questioned during the further stages of research also according to more solid documentation on the site (Heritage, urban development, visit, etc.)

1. Urban Scale

- Possible transversal connections linked to the urban fabric;
- Integration of external spaces for the community;
- Possible of publicness on ground floor level linked to some kind of “collective” forum;
- Other possible public spaces spread around the building to activate on different sides
- Re-use of the existing “shaft towers” for drying pipes as a sign for the site;
- Various entrances for the different actors (housing, Globe-Aroma,)

2. Architecture Scale

- Housing is best double oriented (preferably East and West). This set up could well fit the C building;
- Housing should maybe be spread among the whole building to activate the site through temporality.
- Horizontal circulation spine through the whole building connecting the different activities

Follow up on organization

1. From PERMANENT:

- ✓ Organization of a visit of the building;
- ✓ More detailed ground plans and sections of the building
- ✓ Documents on the urban development (Plans) ?;
- ✓ Document on the heritage?;
- ✓ Organization of further workshops.

2. From AR (if further workshops can be organized):

- ✓ Finalizing program according to the answers from Permanent (see below);
- ✓ Design of one or two scenari of spatial layouts according to the program
- ✓ Figures ?

Homework, questions to the partners

01. Program revision:

This sheet of the program and areas serves as a base to challenge and critically review the questions of the different partners. It is a document under construction. We would like every partner to have an internal review and come back to us with an adapted .xls sheet.

The second part of the PDF document gives a column to indicate for the partners which of the spaces they see as used by themselves only, how do they envision the shared spaces and which are the spaces to share with others

Please write comments, with whom of the other partners or external users you could share spaces with, and maybe indicate the degree of publicness of each function (with some colours maybe)

Evaluate the scale we have proposed for your program and areas. How could it maybe become bigger or smaller according to the available space in the building? Or how could an external partner become part of the project?

02. Which level of finishing you imagine for the project?

03. Why should you partner with the other parties?

04. For housing, is there already a financial plan?

05. Could you propose some references of how you envision the space?

















