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Once a place of celebration and education of Puerto Rican Culture, el Museo del Barrio became a modernized Latin American art institution through extensive renovations. El Museo del Barrio opened in 1969 within a small classroom in PS 125 to provide cultural education to the children of Puerto Rican families that had emigrated to New York. This center was named a museum to not only provide a platform for the community but to establish itself with cultural significance to its surroundings and societal New York.

El Museo del Barrio has continued its significant contribution to East Harlem and the Latin American community by providing programs such as exhibition space for display of permanent and temporary exhibitions, an archive of Latin American art and history, educational spaces for research and classes, the artspace facility for live/work spaces for artists, the media center fully equipped with multimedia spaces, 3 camera television studio and production spaces, el teatro - a full production theater, and event spaces available to lease.

el barrio
The Heckscher Building, where the museo del barrio is currently located, was built in 1921 to serve as an office building for the heckscher foundation but then donated to various organizations to serve as an orphanage. The city purchased it in 1985 and leased it to the museum as well as a variety of non-profits and educational institutions, all integral to the East Harlem community. The building is about 125,000 sq ft total spanning across 6 levels and mostly constructed out of masonry.

Interactions throughout the building will range from intimate to Theatrical, and move on to activities, work, learning, social, and recreational. In the spirit of its historical outreach programs, all programs hosted by el museo’s organization previously located elsewhere throughout the city will be relocated to the main building. The scattered institution will be refocused into a single building, a new social condenser and heart for the Barrio which will engage and draw ever more diverse crowds of New Yorkers and travelers through el barrio’s doors.

To break the rigidity and monumentality of the existing building, a soft mesh covers the entire building - interiorizing the previously exterior masonry space. All contemporary interventions will materialize in lightweight construction, translucent veils and asymmetrical organizations.

The institutions we need

The Heckscher Building, where the museo del barrio is currently located, was built in 1921 to serve as an office building for the heckscher foundation but then donated to various organizations to serve as an orphanage. The city purchased it in 1985 and leased it to the museum as well as a variety of non-profits and educational institutions, all integral to the East Harlem community. The building is about 125,000 sq ft total spanning across 6 levels and mostly constructed out of masonry.

Interactions throughout the building will range from intimate to Theatrical, and move on to activities, work, learning, social, and recreational. In the spirit of its historical outreach programs, all programs hosted by el museo’s organization previously located elsewhere throughout the city will be relocated to the main building. The scattered institution will be refocused into a single building, a new social condenser and heart for the Barrio which will engage and draw ever more diverse crowds of New Yorkers and travelers through el barrio’s doors.

To break the rigidity and monumentality of the existing building, a soft mesh covers the entire building - interiorizing the previously exterior masonry space. All contemporary interventions will materialize in lightweight construction, translucent veils and asymmetrical organizations.

below:
Axonometric diagram depicting an overview of “El Barrio” existing main site and the institutions other programs across East Harlem area.

above:
Axonometric: Sectional diagram of the new proposal for “El Barrio”.

above: Axonometric: Sectional diagram of the new proposal for “El Barrio”.
The plaza will be every guest's first encounter of a gathering place, open to east harlem and the adjacent Central Park. To enhance the open courtyard experience, the walls of the existing first floor were removed, lifting the heaviness and defensive facade to increase porosity and freedom of movement in the plaza.

The removal of the ground floor provides a sheltered space for visitors who want to meet before going into galleries, or spend time outside and hang out for refreshments, and opens space for bigger gatherings and events.

la plaza en el barrio

above: Ground floor plan of El Barrio (nts).

below: South exterior elevation (nts).
la biblioteca en el barrio

The levels above will host offices, galleries and exhibitions, classrooms, a theater and a library. The levels are all accessible and connected through a series of exterior stairs placed in between the existing masonry facade and the new mesh facade.
el forum y la playa

To accommodate the need for additional space, the cooperative spaces will occur on the new top levels of the building, a physically and programmatically open forum, serving as an extension of the public courtyard.

Then, come hang at the rooftop beach. Visitors will be guided to it by a glass elevator that pierces the open space of the courtyard and is taken directly up. Once there, visitors will disrobe, becoming vulnerable. But in their nakedness, they will look out and see the city, the rolling hills of Central Park to the west, the bustling streets of Harlem to the east, and will know that there exists for them a place in the city.

El Barrio will be a place to celebrate all Latin American culture. It will be a gathering place for families and friends to hang out, have festivities, socialize, connect, learn, grow, and find refuge. A place that will exemplify what this community has continuously represented in New York City.
above: Exterior photomontage of la playa on the rooftop.
The piece of theory I will be discussing is “Bauen” by Hannes Meyer. It was a “thesis” published in 1928 within the seventh edition of the Bauhaus journals, simultaneously published while Hannes Meyer’s directed school of Bauhaus, which occurred from 1928 to 1930. The English version was accessed through the book “Programs and Manifestos on Twentieth-Century Architecture” edited by Ulrich Conrads. The book that contains the manifesto by Hannes Meyer also contains multiple declarations written by individuals with some role within modern architecture, architects such as Adolf Loos, Frank Lloyd Wright, Walter Gropius, Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe, among others. The book collected these manifestos and identified the writers as “master builders.” It also claims that nearly every critical development within modern architecture started or was influenced by some proclamation initially made in a program or manifesto. (Conrads, 1975) As a collection, the book presents a diverse set of voices, with a spectrum of interests from small and conservative to exploratory and revolutionary. Since this specific piece was originally in German and published within the Bauhaus publications during the time Meyer led the school, the piece’s audience was most likely students, members, and followers of the Bauhaus. Although this essay aims not to be another essay about Bauhaus, it is necessary to discuss it slightly due to its connection to Hannes Meyer. An attempt at a short description of the school will not only contextualize this piece of theory, given that this essay was published within the Bauhaus publications, but much of the manifesto’s core lies behind the intention that Meyer set while he led the school and its programs, post-Walter Gropius.

It seems as if this piece is not only part of Meyer’s position and beliefs in the “architectural” industry, as the theme of his paper reflects other ideals and concepts he stated in other pieces, but it also reflects ideals he imposed into the Bauhaus program while he led the school. He might have written this piece to persuade his students into reconsidering the meaning of architecture, while he led the school. As applied in Meyer’s writing piece, Bauen is not the word building, the noun, but building (to build), the verb. He also lists building materials such as concrete, canvas, leather, resin, acetone, glue and categorized them as part of life, including phase of the process of producing architecture, which is not an aesthetic process. Although that may be possible, there is an entire process of designing prior to getting to build that includes the process of color composition, graphics, material selection or experimentation, personal tastes, and interests. There are also ephemeral experiences and conditions in architecture produced by the materials chosen and the construction and amalgamation of those materials, yet they cannot quantify the experience. Meyer questioned the process of how to plan for a dwelling and whether it qualifies as composition or function, then listed the functional acts that occur within the boundaries of a house, stating that a house only needed to satisfy these needs.

1. sex life, 2. sleeping habits, 3. pets, 4. gardening, 5. personal hygiene, 6. weather protection, 7. hygiene in the home, 8. car maintenance, 9. cooking, 10. heating, 11. exposure to the sun, 12. services” (Meyer, 1928).

There was no explanation regarding the order of the list, but there was some peculiarity in the listed order. The first function on the list was sex life, followed up by sleeping habits, then pets. If numbered from most to least important, Meyer’s list is incredibly provocative. For instance, if a dwelling can provide space for sex life, is the purpose of a dwelling entirely satisfactory? Is car maintenance more essential than cooking? Did Meyer envision the needs of some stereotype of his era? Listing car maintenance before cooking or heating brings up a few points. Firstly, is the ideal dwelling intended to satisfy a particular class that owns cars and has the luxury of space to service their cars at home? When the concept of interest in cars and machine work was heavily associated with men, is this dwelling Meyer envisions for a pet? Is the purpose of a house reduced to just these activities, and would humans love the house just because it satisfied them? Can the success of a built house be measured because it satisfied the success of a dwelling with regard to the storage of cars, as garages. In this case, it could also be pointed out that the requirements for a dwelling may be site-specific in a city where individual car storage is accessible. So, whose functional needs are these dwellings planned for, and who was Meyer’s target demographic?

Would it take some composition, art, and experiential consideration to make the experience more enjoyable for humans? How important is it to consider building a human-scale dwelling for a pet? Is the purpose of a house reduced to just these activities, and would humans love the house just because it satisfied them? Can the success of a built house be measured because it satisfied the success of a dwelling with regard to the storage of cars, as garages. In this case, it could also be pointed out that the requirements for a dwelling may be site-specific in a city where individual car storage is accessible. So, whose functional needs are these dwellings planned for, and who was Meyer’s target demographic?

Because art is only compositional and subjective, it cannot achieve realistic goals and that life is functional and therefore is not artistic. If “building” is a biological process, then it is not an aesthetic process. Although that may be possible, there is an entire process of designing prior to getting to build that includes the process of color composition, graphics, material selection or experimentation, personal tastes, and interests. There are also ephemeral experiences and conditions in architecture produced by the materials chosen and the construction and amalgamation of those materials, yet they cannot quantify the experience. Meyer questioned the process of how to plan for a dwelling and whether it qualifies as composition or function, then listed the functional acts that occur within the boundaries of a house, stating that a house only needed to satisfy these needs.

1. sex life, 2. sleeping habits, 3. pets, 4. gardening, 5. personal hygiene, 6. weather protection, 7. hygiene in the home, 8. car maintenance, 9. cooking, 10. heating, 11. exposure to the sun, 12. services” (Meyer, 1928).
However, to better understand Meyer's theory, it may be helpful to understand the context of his life up to this point, his education, and how he applied these concepts to the Bauhaus school when he directed it.

Walter Gropius opened a school in Germany in 1919 called Staatliches Bauhaus. It was a school focused on uniting all trades of art with one institution. The school was also an experimental approach, and push forward normative boundaries of art produced within the school. Throughout the 1920s, led by Gropius, the Bauhaus was recognized as a robust modern art movement and school of thought within art, design, and architecture. (Jeske) The movement associated primarily through both their art and architecture. People associated with the Bauhaus titled a student, master, director, associate with no specific teaching assignment. Although departments within the school focused on respective trades, interdisciplinary practices still heavily encouraged. When the school opened, Gropius declared the school's intention through a "manifesto. " Architects, sculptors, painters," he argued, "must all turn to crafts. Art is not a "profession." There is no one who is not an artist and a craftsman." (Gropius, 1919). The Bauhaus had been known to thread between the architecture department within Bauhaus, a department Gropius intended to incorporate into the school. After Gropius led the school for nine years, he selected Meyer as the new director of the Bauhaus.

Meyer believed that the school should collaborate, cross trades, and create a comprehensive understanding of tools and technology to create a mass-producing culture. He set up the architecture school to focus on real projects, allowing students to collaborate on his large-scale commissions. The students to gain professional experience, however, there was a specific teaching assignment. Although departments within the school for nine years, he selected Meyer as the new director of the Bauhaus. Gropius hired Hannes Meyer to start and direct the architecture department within Bauhaus, a department Gropius intended to be released in a quarterly method. Occasionally, the students to gain professional experience, however, there was a specific teaching assignment. Although departments within the school focused on respective trades, interdisciplinary practices still heavily encouraged.

The first issue of the Bauhaus Journal was released at the opening of the new Bauhaus building in Dessau in 1926. The journal included graphic work from Herbert Bayer and Josef Albers, who were "building a movement, building a reputation, building a future." The journal was in the typical Bauhaus typeface, designed by Herbert Bayer, which leads to the composition of the chairs, which appear like variations of the same concept or design, which in spite of all: to prepare a more cheerful work of carefree times. (Bauhaus, 1928)

The length of the journal varied through editors at its peak production, consisted of about forty pages and included advertisements at the end of the journal. The journal also included graphic work from Herbert Bayer and Josef Albers, who were still recognizable today as some of the iconic graphic representations of the Bauhaus movement. There are 14 issues of the Bauhaus journal, of which four were published under Walter Gropius and Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, six were published under Johannes Itten, six were published under Hannes Meyer, and six were published under Herbert Bayer and Joost Schmidt, which are adjacent to paintings and sculptures. Are these chairs, once signed the chairs, and they were produced within the Bauhaus. The photographs of four chairs. A few affiliates of the Bauhaus designed the chairs, and they were produced within the Bauhaus. The chairs all seem like variations of the same concept or design, which includes a short horizontal back rail for back support, a square seat, and slanted legs. The mostnoticeable characteristic of these chairs is the scale of buildings or buildings themselves, such as Gordon Matta-Clark and Cedric Price. (Bauhaus, 1928)

Through this collaboration, the Bauhaus received direct commissions such as the AGDB Trade Union Museum in Bernau, Germany. Commissioned as a UNESCO site, the AGDB Trade Union Museum had all interiors designed through Bauhaus workshops. With such a tight deadline, it was expected that the school was simultaneously to produce a profit. The AGDB building is the perfect case study for functionalist architecture, and Meyer was famously known for being a functionalist architect. (Bauhaus, Cooperation)

Gropius intentionally hired Hannes specifically for his functionalist design thinking. Shortly after taking the reins of the school, his reorganization of programs tested the policies ingrained within the school and highlighted Meyer's political views and, in particular, his disdain towards the Nazi regime and political issues. Of course, in a typical Bauhaus setting, individuality and artistic expression were celebrated, and the chairs might have possibly been mentioned in the manifesto. However, they were not mentioned in the English version, which leads to the composition of the chairs, which appear like variations of the same concept or design, which in spite of all: to prepare a more cheerful work of carefree times. (Bauhaus, 1928)

We want to grip the building and design of our time with a little bit of an obsession. The act of building becomes a little bit of an obsession. The movement disseminated concepts of functionality through advertising, which led to the composition of the chairs. If the chairs in the "Bauen" essay had been photographed towards the right, presenting the chair from a corner perspective that gives a comprehensive view of the chair. The chairs all seem like variations of the same concept or design, which includes a short horizontal back rail for back support, a square seat, and slanted legs. The most noticeable characteristic of these chairs is the scale of buildings or buildings themselves, such as Gordon Matta-Clark and Cedric Price. (Bauhaus, 1928)

The Bauhaus school set a powerful core for the school by aiming to create a confluence of trades and collectively learn from each other's knowledge. Meyer was often recognized as a functionalist architect and was associated with an architect and sculptor. In the context of his understanding and embracing the new Bauhaus building in Dessau in 1926. The journal was icon of experimentation with type fonts and images, assuming that the chairs, once signed the chairs, and they were produced within the Bauhaus. The photographs of four chairs. A few affiliates of the Bauhaus designed the chairs, and they were produced within the Bauhaus. The chairs all seem like variations of the same concept or design, which includes a short horizontal back rail for back support, a square seat, and slanted legs. The most noticeable characteristic of these chairs is the scale of buildings or buildings themselves, such as Gordon Matta-Clark and Cedric Price. (Bauhaus, 1928)

If we genuinely reflected Meyer's ideals into the entire process of designing and producing architecture, what would be the result of such work? Would building the new, reflect an industrial or practical/institutional sense such as prisons or industrial sheds? Would prefabrication methods indeed be the best way to approach it? If prefabrication took on and construction documents or "installation manuals" for these structures were commonly shared in and circulation with everyone, would society need architects anymore? It seems like a radical way to approach architecture. However, it makes one to more expect from Bauhaus a new, more so, to expect from a school whose literal name is construction and in circulation with everyone, would society need architects anymore? It seems like a radical way to approach architecture. However, it makes one to more expect from Bauhaus a new, more so, to expect from a school whose literal name is construction and
The studio consisted of developing an adaptive-reuse proposal for the 13th Regiment Armory in Bed-Stuy, Brooklyn. The studio aimed to reuse the 1889 structure and convert it into a contemporary cultural-leisure center. The program is inspired by the SESC model of Brazil: an urban cultural center that functions as a true gathering place for work, studying, playing non-competitive sports, etc.

Because the neighborhood of Bed-Stuy is densely built, the main strategy of the project is to embrace the Armory drill hall’s existing void and multiplying (and reassembling) the sense of emptiness in the space. Collectively, multiplied voids produce a block size, public space surrounded by urban density.

The new proposal remains contextual through connections to the ground and sky, creating moments of visual and tectonic relation with the old structures but physically separating the intervention from it. This idea is what defined the project architecturally.
The relationship with the existing shell is developed through the voids by offsetting the new structure away from the existing masonry walls. From the ground floor, a visual connection to the walls remains. The entry “street” is connected to the main oblique circulation that goes from the sky-living room to the underground pool.

To avoid constructing mass above ground, the voids also excavate through the subterranean realm. The heavier programs were placed in the underground levels, such as the pool and the theatre.

Above the ground level, the architectural language changes to an airy metallic structure that continues to represent a sense of void. The old trusses of the historic building were replaced by a thinner, lighter six meter by six meter steel grid structure supported by the cylindrical concrete columns underground. Within the grid, there are large voids that allow for a variation of flexibility in use and program.

On top of this cloud of steel columns and beams, one will encounter the living room. The highlight of the leisure center, as it is the gathering-to-do-nothing place. This space visually connects with the adjacent top of the armory, as a castle in the sky.
Cross section through the sports courts and sky-living space.

Underground floor plan (nts).

Rendering of underground sports courts.
left top: Cross section drawing through the theatre, library and sky-living space.
left bottom: Third floor plan (nts).
right: Longitudinal Section of existing armory and new proposal.
top: Cross section drawing through underground pool, work studios, and sky-living space.

bottom: Fourth floor plan of sky-living space (nts).
Through a series of assignments that explored different techniques, narratives, lighting, and styles, the aim of this class was to rethink how to read and capture architecture (and physical models). The body of work shown are only a few moments from various assignments, but as a collective they are a result of an exploration of vantage points, lighting, and well-framed and captured moments.

right: Photograph of National Maritime Union building (O’Toole Building) in Greenwich Village, NY.
Photograph of 508 W 24th St. from the High Line in Chelsea, NY.

Photograph of a brick building from the High Line in Chelsea, NY.
above: Photograph of Beinecke Rare Book Library in New Haven, CT.
This studio focused on studying the Brooklyn Army Terminal originally built as a supply base for the United States Army around 1918. The base consists of multiple buildings that served as the supply base, warehouse, exchange depot for materials, and administration offices. Through a series of revitalization projects, it is now owned by the city and leased to local businesses for commercial and light industrial uses with an emphasis on tenants that will provide or strengthen the B.A.T’s circular economy.

Brooklyn Culinary Terminal is a school, market, and farm for one and all.

The Brooklyn Culinary Terminal is a proposal to occupy the B.A.T’s unleased spaces and use as a neighborhood culinary school, an urban farm, a market, and shops and cafes - all interconnected to exchange resources, services, and knowledge.

The new B.C.T program also deploys a path that starts from the neighborhood, connects to the B.A.T and ends at the adjacent ferry terminal. This will provide exposure to the B.A.T and an accessible path to all to access the terminal. Along the path you will encounter the learning programs, produce exchange locations, urban farming spots, farmers markets, cafes, restaurants and more.
Top:
Exterior photomontage of path through neighborhood towards BCT.

Bottom:
Exterior photomontage of path through farmers market towards BCT.

Left:
Axonometric diagram of existing tenant occupancies and vacancies.

Right:
Axonometric diagram of design process, developing the BCT connecting path to new spaces.
accessible path through the BCT

top: Axonometric diagram sequence depicting accessible path and program throughout the BCT.

level four

level three

level two

level one

top: Exterior photomontage of path through main entrance of BCT.
bottom: Exterior photomontage of path through the atrium of BCT.

42 43 brooklyn culinary terminal
Diagram of food recuperation and sustainability protocol that is followed at the BCT kitchens.

Diagram of food recuperation and sustainability protocol that is followed at the BCT markets.

Diagram of food/goods cycle and food recuperation and sustainability protocol that is followed at the BCT kitchens.
The NYC/EDC (New York City Economic Development Corporation) manages the Brooklyn Army Terminal. They stated that an aim on circular economy methods is imperative to keep the B.A.T thriving.

The BCT developed its multiple programs through consideration of how it could create its own circular economy and participate/interact with other tenants and local businesses of Sunset Park in Brooklyn.

The food that is grown and cultivated at BCT can be sold at the farmers market, be gifted or exchanged in the produce exchange locations, cooked in the neighborhood cooking classes or the cafes and restaurants within the BCT/BAT.

The cycle is not just an economic/financial cycle but a constant exchange of goods and resources, knowledge, and social interactions. Another key cycle occurring within the BCT is the adequate processes to reduce food waste. The BCT programs provide educational support to the community on how to reduce food waste but it also implements food recuperation and sustainability protocols because food is constantly mishandled in markets, restaurants, and in domestic settings.
Above: Interior photomontage of path through interior market.