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Abstract

The “Rose Herbert Community Center” is the culmination of a project questioning how a building can be restored to its original integrity when its initial function has become extinct. This thesis considers the Broad Street Station in Richmond, Virginia and explores the options and implications of returning the building to a hub of interaction within the community. Concepts such as functionally malleable spaces, the transition from a very public environment to a more private area, and the creation of intentional interaction versus coexistence are explored.
Manifesto

Design is altruistic.

The collaboration between a designer and client initiates a selfless process. Design is not an imposition of one’s ideas, but an opportunity to encourage and affirm another’s thoughts and desires. The needs of the client and the users of the space must be taken into account before the designer’s intentions. The designer serves to create the ideal environment for the client.

The goal of the designer is to embrace, yet challenge what is known in a quest to identify new solutions. The search for the unknown goes beyond materials and connections, and questions the original intentions of conventional design. This process becomes a deep exploration for the designer himself. Development becomes a cycle of creating and questioning. Identification and reflection on his understandings of the world and his environment are required in order to arrive at discovery.

The inherent existence of introspection throughout the design process supports the statement that every design is intrinsically an extension of its creator. A designer’s thoughts, values, and beliefs are the foundation of every project. Each venture is a giving of himself to the space created.

Although design can be viewed as self-serving to the designer through this means of a personal process, the recursive nature cannot be ignored. Questions asked and decisions made have personal meaning to the designer, but the effects directly affect the public. This cyclical nature of the process is never lost on the designer. There is a constant reminder that his journey of challenging and questioning the known to arrive at the unknown is for the benefit of others.

Because of this process, design is altruistic. The creative process is selfless; all focus is placed on the client and users of the space. Whether designing a space of solitude or of community, the experience of an individual is imperative. Design is the ultimate gesture of respect, and by challenging his own sense of self, the designer is making a declaration of value, acknowledging both the users’ existence and experience.
Introduction
Introduction

Richmond's Broad Street Station is undergoing a transformation in order to foster and serve the surrounding community.

Limited to altering only the interior of the historic train station, the design will embrace its site and the integrity of the structure. The conversion will take notice of and celebrate the architecture and detailing throughout the building.

Originally constructed in 1917 by John Russell Pope, the station has been a prominent feature in Richmond, Virginia. It is located at 2500 W. Broad Street, a main road through the city, allowing for its central location. The building served as the site for the Science Museum of Virginia until growth required the organization to seek another property. The combination of historical significance, beauty of the structure, and location make Broad Street Station an ideal site for a community center.

This project will consider the entirety of the 76,660 square foot building, but detailed design will be focused on a portion of the arts center covering about 9,000 square feet within the first floor.
Richmond’s Broad Street Station was built by the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad in 1917. The architect was John Russell Pope, also known for the National Archives and Records Administration Building, the Jefferson Memorial, and the National Gallery of Art. As evidenced by its dome, the selected style was Neoclassical.

Although placed on the National Register for Historic Places in 1972, the station ceased use for railway passengers in 1975. The building was quickly converted into the Science Museum of Virginia, which opened in 1977. Today, the building is surrounded by a combination of industrial, residential, and commercial areas.

Access is gained by a main road that runs throughout Richmond and passes immediately in front of the building. Additionally, an adjacent street connects the site to the interstate. Centrally located in Richmond, the station is only two miles from downtown.
Code Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Area per Occupant</th>
<th>Occupancy Load</th>
<th>Max. Exit (w/o sprinklers)</th>
<th>Max. Exit (w/ sprinklers)</th>
<th>Max. Dead End Corridor</th>
<th>Stair Width per Person</th>
<th>Min. Corridor Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole Building</td>
<td>76660</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5112</td>
<td>200'</td>
<td>250'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>0.37&quot;</td>
<td>44&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min. Clear Opening for Exits</th>
<th>Min. Stair Width</th>
<th>Water Closets (Male)</th>
<th>Water Closets (Female)</th>
<th>Lavatories</th>
<th>Drinking Fountains</th>
<th>Service Sink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32&quot;</td>
<td>44&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st Floor
- Elevator
- Fire-Rated Staircase
- Restrooms

2nd Floor

3rd Floor

1st Floor
- Elevator
- Fire-Rated Staircase
- Restrooms
Research Program Case Studies
The Lawrence Arts Center was newly constructed and opened in 2002. The vision for the center was to promote an “arts community.” Therefore, a connection with the community itself was a must. Built in Downtown Lawrence, the building is accessible by a wide variety of residents.

The “arts community” is seen to fruition by several means. An arts-based kindergarten is housed within the arts center, promoting creative education and a place of gathering. Many studios for various uses were designed within the space, as well as a theater and several galleries. The building was designed with only one main entrance, which leads into an open lobby. This space allows visitors of all kinds to cross paths and interact with one another. Galleries in the main corridors offer the opportunity for passersby to discuss pieces with one another. These spaces were strategically planned, so that people in the building for various reasons will undoubtedly cross paths.
These diagrams show the functional diversification of adjacent spaces. This intentional design elongates users’ pathways, therefore increasing activity in the corridors and causing users to interact with one another. Gallery spaces on all three floors allow visitors to discover areas of the building beyond the lobby. Through this experience they may gain a better understanding of what classes are available, or see the variety of students using the Arts Center. Studios are available on the lower and second floors, allowing students to see the variety of spaces.

In order to simplify circulation, spaces of similar users are generally adjacent to one another. As shown in these diagrams of the Lawrence Arts Center, adjacent spaces have been designed for a variety of users. Increasing interaction between the two types of users leads to a better understanding of uses within the building and creates interaction with and an appreciation for the other users. Understanding the various activities at the Arts Center creates a more holistic perspective and allows users to recognize its place within the community.
Diagram of Public vs. Private

The amount of private space within the Arts Center is limited to offices, closets, and mechanical spaces. These diagrams depict the Center’s commitment to being available to the public. In addition, the ability to navigate freely throughout the building allows users to gain a better understanding of the space and form a sense of belonging over time.

Diagram of Natural Light

The use of natural light was carefully thought out in the design of the building. Floor to ceiling windows along the west wall of the lobby allow the communal space to be flooded with daylight. The offices and studios along the west wall also allow for natural daylight. The preschool classrooms have functional glass doors that not only allow light to illuminate the space, but also create a direct connection with the outdoors.
## Program Case Studies

### Square Footage Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Lower Floor (sqf)</th>
<th>Entry Floor (sqf)</th>
<th>Second Floor (sqf)</th>
<th>Total (sqf)</th>
<th>Percentage of Space</th>
<th>Avg. sqf/space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galleries</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>3580</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>5080</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7025</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>2713</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6686</td>
<td>9399</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>3890</td>
<td>4724</td>
<td></td>
<td>8414</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Restrooms</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>17813</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby &amp; Hallways</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18860</strong></td>
<td><strong>18980</strong></td>
<td><strong>19480</strong></td>
<td><strong>57320</strong></td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Square Footage Calculations
Lewis Ginter Botanical Gardens covers about eighty acres of land. A wide variety of plants from around the world are on public display, and the Gardens house a library and herbarium. Members of the community can volunteer, and there are classes for both children and adults. And while many people enjoy walking through and observing the plant life, the Gardens are also very well known for hosting special events. The Gardens put on events like the GardenFest of Lights, Flowers After Five, and various exhibits and displays. The public also uses the amenities to host private events, such as wedding ceremonies and receptions, corporate meetings or workshops, and holiday parties.

Many sites, both indoor and outdoor, are available for use at the Botanical Gardens. Two rental coordinators help clients to select the correct site depending on their needs and expectations. A majority of the sites available offer flexibility through furniture arrangements. This flexibility is vital, because it allows for the same spaces to be used in a multitude of ways.

Lewis Ginter Botanical Gardens
Richmond, Virginia

Facility Rentals by Event

Weddings
- Bloemendaal House
- Bloemendaal Tent
- Robins Tea House
- Robins Visitors Center
- Robins Room
- Cafe
- Massey Conference Center Auditorium
- Flagler Pavilion
- Grace Arents Garden

Corporate
- Bloemendaal House
- Bloemendaal Tent
- Robins Tea House
- Robins Visitors Center
- Robins Room
- Cafe
- Massey Conference Center Auditorium
- Auditorium Partial Space #3
- Azalea Room

Holiday
- Bloemendaal House
- Robins Visitors Center
- Education and Library Complex Auditorium
- Azalea Room
Program Case Studies

Square Footage by Event

Weddings
Served Meal: 30 sqf/person
Buffet Meal: 47 sqf/person
Cocktail Reception: 19 sqf/person
12’x12’ dance floor

Corporate
Served Meal: 22 sqf/person
Buffet Meal: 26 sqf/person
Cocktail Reception: 16 sqf/person
Theater Style: 11 sqf/person

Holiday
Served Meal, no dancing: 26 sqf/person
Served Meal, dancing: 19 sqf/person
Buffet Meal, no dancing: 28 sqf/person
Buffet Meal, dancing: 28 sqf/person
Cocktail Reception, no dancing: 15 sqf/person
Cocktail Reception, dancing: 18 sqf/person

Lewis Ginter Botanical Gardens offers several spaces available for facilities rentals. Each building offers several potential arrangements. The adjacencies of the rooms and elements within them allow for the spaces and their functionality to become versatile.
Researching the Lawrence Arts Center and Lewis Ginter Botanical Gardens clarified the range of issues surrounding my project. The Arts Center allowed me to start questioning: What is interaction? How important is it within a space designed for fostering community? What is the line between increasing interaction through various means and creating chaos? These issues are the foundation of my design for my thesis. In addition, my research conducted at this institution started giving me insight to the needs of studio spaces. I also visited the Glen Allen Cultural Arts Center in Glen Allen, Virginia, the Visual Arts Center in Richmond, Virginia, and the Virginia Commonwealth University School of the Arts in Richmond, Virginia, in order to further my understanding of various studio requirements.

The spaces at Lewis Ginter Botanical Gardens provided examples of functionally flexible spaces. Observing the facilities rental locations helped demonstrate the importance of specified, well-designed storage, which allows the spaces to be converted quickly and easily. Observing the various partition systems was also very informative.
The design team of Liz Diller and Ric Scofidio (D&S) were invited to collaborate with others, forming the group Extasia, in the creation of an exhibition for the 2001 Swiss Expo. Awarded the Yverdon site, located on a lake, which was given the concept of “I and the Universe.”

After several brainstorming sessions, Extasia selected to use the concept of making “something out of nothing.” The idea was to create a floating cloud above the lake, one which visitors could walk through. The experience would require observers to engage with the site on a mental level, as well as physical. The exhibition itself would be titled “Blur.”

The exhibition was in jeopardy several times due to political issues within the exhibition, as well as the design of Blur itself. The design process involved ideas of elaborate media, such as projectors, cameras, and even specially designed raincoats that interact with the wearer. In the end, simplification of the project was both a logistical and design necessity.

Translation: “It’s all been done before. Many visitors were outraged and could not understand what possible purpose a noisy rattling machine could have which clearly didn’t produce anything. So un-Swiss!

We don’t need the cloud either. It doesn’t water our fields nor does it regulate our climate. It is just simply beautiful. Are people today more playful than they were forty years ago? The cloud is enchanting visitors right off the bat. What a crazy idiosyncratic thing! How deliciously without purpose. Miracles are possible. All of a sudden one sees the crotchety Swiss, after visiting the cloud, laughing and giving their raincoats to someone in line—a raincoat for which they themselves paid three francs for after all. The cloud has enchanted the country.”
Commissioned by the University of Cincinnati, Peter Eisenman designed the Aronoff Center for the College of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning (DAAP). The goals for the building were to unify the East and West Campuses, and to integrate the University and the community. It was also designed to reorganize the three existing buildings that housed the DAAP that were only connected by stairwells, and add an additional 150,000 square feet.

Eisenman is known for many architectural projects, including the Wexner Center, the Berlin Holocaust Memorial, and the University of Phoenix Stadium. A major design goal of his is to break away from any historical references and create something referring only to the immediate time and space. In order to pursue this, Eisenman uses a variety of media including diagrams, computer models, and 3-D modeling. For each project, he devises a system that allows his to arrive at a design which was previously unknown. In this process, he uses elements such as algorithms, fractals, brain imaging, and topography. The goal is always to design something without knowing what exactly is being created.

Eisenman's goal for this project was to disturb and challenge students using the space. A degree of discomfort was intended, forcing the students to “bring the body back into the mind/eye relationship.”

Eisenman created one 40’x70’x15’6" component. Included were one studio, two areas for graduate students, two faculty offices, and a portion of the corridor through which access is gained.

A series of components were arranged in a linear fashion. Computer-generated algorithms were used to overlap adjacent units. The algorithm guaranteed a random degree of overlapping, creating variable, unknowable spaces.

The line of components was curved to add complexity to the relationship between the rectilinear existing structure and the new addition.

The chevron is repeated, and each is adjusted relative to each building’s north corner. This lessens the distinction between the original chevron form and its traces.

Combining the stepping series with the torqued series creates a new form. Eisenman refers to this as "box geometry."
"This is an addition to existing buildings; proof that to make a work of art, you don’t have to destroy everything before it.”

- Henry Cobb

Eisenman was very intentional in his design. His complete focus was on the users of the space. He felt it was imperative to have congregational spaces within the new building.

Left: A portion of Eisenman’s concept was to use crannies to allow the space to feel bigger. Many impromptu nooks are utilized regularly by students and faculty.

Below: Eisenman fought for such elements as the 15’ wide stairs. The school preferred standard staircases, as it was only viewed as a means of vertical transition. Eisenman felt that students needed a place to congregate, to cross paths, and to interact.
I found the contrast between Diller and Scofidio’s work and Peter Eisenman’s work very interesting. Diller and Scofidio started with a concept and made all subsequent decisions based on strengthening its integrity. They developed new methods of construction and products in order for their abstract project to be realized.

Using an entirely different process, Eisenman focused on the logistics of his building first. One unit was created to serve several functions, and then multiplied to create the square footage needed to meet the programmatic requirements. Once the logistical issues were resolved, Eisenman then used systems and algorithms to manipulate the form and respond to the site.
In order to attract a wide range of users, the community center will be comprised of three entities: a restaurant, an arts center, and a facility rentals office. There are many areas within the building that can lend themselves to a variety of uses by the public, allowing the optimal opportunity to rent portions of the facility. The restaurant will have the capacity for seventy-five people and will be prominently located in the building to allow access to the public. An arts center will be located on several floors throughout the building. Included will be studios for dance, music, and crafts; Space allowing for performances (musical and stage); Gallery or exhibit space for art; and a theater for use by the arts center, traveling productions, and facility rentals. Interaction is desired for all users of the space in order to create and foster community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Commercial kitchen</th>
<th>Seating for 75-100 people</th>
<th>Furniture must allow for rearranging of the space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts Center</td>
<td>Offices for at least 6 people</td>
<td>Studios for dance, music, and crafts</td>
<td>Space allowing for performances (musical and stage); Gallery or exhibit space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Facilities</td>
<td>Offices for at least two people</td>
<td>Large ballroom</td>
<td>Minimum of two medium-sized spaces; Minimum of two small-sized spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjacency Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacency</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Adjacencies</th>
<th>Public Access</th>
<th>Daylight/View</th>
<th>Parking/ Plumbing</th>
<th>Special Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Arts Center Offices (ACO)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2, 18</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>easily visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ACO Restrooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1, 18</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Drawing/Printing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ceramics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 Photography | 1 | 1200 | | U | N | Y | \_
| 6 Fiber | 1 | 500 | | | Y | N | Y |
| 7 Woodworking | 1 | 500 | 15 | | U | N | N |
| 8 Graphic Imaging/Film | 1 | 1900 | 5, 9, 11 | | | N | N |
| 9 Editing Room | 1 | 500 | 8 | | N | N | sound proof |
| 10 Jewelry | 1 | 600 | | | U | N | Y |
| 11 Writing | 1 | 500 | 8 | | U | N | N |
| 12 Theater | 1 | 8400 | 15, 16 | Y | N | N | backstage; 1040 at stage; 1200 at \_
| 13 Mock Theater | 1 | 3000 | 13 | N | N | N |
| 14 Reading Rooms | 4 | 250 | 14 | | I | N | N |
| 15 Theater Restrooms | 2 | 750 | 12 | | I | N | Y |
| 16 Scene Shop | 1 | 1750 | 7, 12 | | | N | N |
| 17 Dance Studios | 2 | 3000 | | | U | N | N |
| 18 Facility Rentals Office | 2 | 250 | 1, 2 | | U | N | N | easily accessible |
| 19 Restaurant | 1 | 2800 | 20, 21, 22 | | U | N | Y | open to rotunda |
| 20 Reception | 1 | 30 | 1, 18, 19 | Y | Y | N | N | directly visible |
| 21 Gift Shop | 1 | 1000 | 2, 18, 20, 21, 22 | Y | U | N | N | directly visible |
| 22 Gallery | 1 | 1000 | 1, 18, 19, 20, 21 | N | N | N | \_
| 23 Music Studios | 4 | 260 | | N | N | N | sound proof |
| 24 Mechanical | -- | 3165 | | N | N | N | Y |

H = High  I = Intermediate  U = Undetermined  Y = Yes  N = No
The process of mind mapping confirmed that the goal and strength of a community center is to increase interaction among its users. Housing a restaurant and an arts center, as well as allowing the opportunity for facility rentals within one building greatly increases the range of users.

The arts center itself created a unique opportunity to increase interaction. The adjacencies between studios was explored in order to identify all spaces that could potentially overlap, allowing students to connect with one another.
The existing parti calls out the main central axis, the result of the building constructed as a train station. In an effort to create interaction between all users in the space, the desired parti creates a link between the two wings. The geometry of the existing structural columns was used to further organize the parti: A central axis between the rotunda and the arts center, and a major pathway through the arts center, create opportunities to welcome new users to the space. Beyond the pathways, the geometry of the building was utilized again to organize areas of interaction between the studios.

The development of a concept model exploring “the one and the many” placed a surprising amount of focus on the voids versus the solids. Synthesizing this realization with the mind maps, it was understood that the most optimal opportunities to create interaction were outside the studios of the arts center. This created a shift in the importance of the studios themselves versus the areas that surround them.

Many of the same pieces creating one larger form. Dividing the form, allowing it to be created by three. Assigning each individual form properties to differentiate them, yet allowing the form to still remain cohesive.
1. Men’s Restroom
2. Conference Room
3. Women’s Restroom
4. Kiln Room
5. Ceramics Studio
6. Jewelry Studio
7. Corridor
8. Lounge
9. Painting/Drawing Studio
10. Storage
11. Fibers Studio
12. Storage
The rotunda creates the experience of the Broad Street Station. Its height and architectural detailing are inspiring and eloquently request observation. The space allows visitors to take a moment and appreciate their surroundings.
A permeable wall has been designed between the rotunda and the arts center. If all rotating panels are closed, the wall appears as though it is continuous. Opening several panels creates windows into the studio, and opening all of the panels creates a doorway. This newly formed access has several uses, including allowing the mobile storage units to be moved into other parts of the building. For example, this could allow for a painting class to now be held in the rotunda or corridor.
Throughout the corridor of the arts center, the vertical space has been utilized to create interaction among the various users. Along the south wall of the corridor, individual student cubbies run along the floor inside the studio. Directly above them, in the hallway, are benches cut into the thickness of the wall. The other side of the corridor offers locker storage to students. Sitting on top of the lockers and extending into the jewelry studio is a workbench. This allows the same vertical space to be independently accessed and functional. Large spans of glass enable passersby to observe work and potentially interact with students in the studios.
The two studios toward the front of the building are comprised of mobile elements. A large storage space has been designed to easily allow access to materials from either studio. Elements such as lightweight easels, cabinetry, looms, and drying racks on casters, and large mobile walls ensure that both spaces are equally flexible.

Adaptability in these spaces is vital. It ensures that the most visible studios will always be occupied. In addition, the mobile cabinetry allows potential for other spaces within the building to be used as temporary studios.

A central pathway can easily be accessed by manipulating the large rotating panels, as well as opening both studios into one large space.
Materials

1. Benjamin Moore Paint: Sea Haze 2137-50
2. Benjamin Moore Paint: Mauve Blush 2115-45
3. Benjamin Moore Paint: James River Gray AC-23
4. Benjamin Moore Paint: Springfield Bar AC-6
6. Benjamin Moore Paint: Louisville Green JC-113
7. Benjamin Moore Paint: Copley Gray HC-104
8. Interlam Wall Panel: Blade
9. Stainless Steel
10. Concrete
11. Maharam Wall Covering: Panama Texture: Putty 006
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