

THE LAYOUT PROCESS OF THE INDIVIDUAL HOUSE

Each house is laid on the site by the individual family.

The layout is done by following the rules

* What are the advantages of this process? Why did we introduce this process

* The main theme of the rules is to create a center while laying out the house.

Was this understood and ~~imp~~ made by the families?

Did the families come with preconceived ideas about their house form, and tried to place the house on the site without really paying attention to it.

Amy is an example of it. But I think she had the site in mind

Nahman is another example. They talked a lot between them about their house. She had the site in mind, but more than anything he wanted a layout plan that would make possible the use of the basement.

Eser had a ready plan. He came this this on the site, and he staked it without really paying attention to the site.

I think that Roudmans and Bell-Kligels were the ~~x~~ two families that understood the idea and the essence of the rules best; their attitude while they were laying out their houses was really relaxed. They paid attention to the site.

preconceived
schemes
rules

There were issues of proximity between houses that concerned the families a lot. When they were to lay the boundaries of their houses one of the first thing they were doing was to guarantee as long distance as possible from the next door house or from an adjacent path. In some cases that was fine, in some other cases that was a problem, because such an attitude damaged the outdoor space central and common to the group of houses. I had to talk a lot with Nahman and Amy to settle the distance between their houses. They wanted them too far apart, fact that that would spoil their common land. Finally we compromised in-between. Also, the garden wall of Amy's house proved to save the situation, since it created a buffer zone between the houses, and it was much easire easier to move it closer to Nahman's house, which we agreed to move it also closer to Amy's house for about one meter, so that the view terrace in between has a good size and shape.

Proximity
Privacy

Bellin had a same kind of problem with the adjacent street. Although it seemed that we had resolved this issue after the layout was completed, they came back with the same problem, one month later, after we had send them the preliminary drawings of the houses.

Why these kind of problems emerged? Were they legitimate as far as the privacy of the families concerned, or was it an e exaggeration. The fact is that this created a conflict between the issue of privacy between families and the issue of posititive and good shape and intimate size of the common land of the cluster.

Conflict
Positive space

Did the people locate their houses successfully on the site. How did the rules help them to do so. How much did the site its configuration and the already existing houses determined it, and how much other concerns, view, privacy detrmined it. The case of Perlman, the last house in the cluster, was a difficult one. ~~But~~ The problems he had were legitimate. The view was problematic from his house. His attitude was correct. He sacrificed view to Shape the cluster?

Eytan's house was located w very successfully. Each family did its best, I think to meet its needs and desires about privacy (major concern), view (another one) and contribute to the shaping of the cluster. Alper was a difficult case. We had to move the houses in front of his house slightly apart from each other so that we would place his house in the place that made more sense.

There were no lots defined in the moshav, owned by specific families, before the layout process started. That was probab Each family had chosen its house location at the time the layout of the moshav took place. Most of the families at this time chose places on the edge of the hill to benefit the maximum from the view. All new families had to be located behind these houses, so that the clusters could get completed.

Anyway the point that I want to raise is that that the idea that lot definition follows the layout of the house favors helps to layout and form the public space better, take it into serious conside ration . However, the problem is not as simple.

Location of houses

Land ownership

It creates a feeling of unlimited freedom. Everybody wants the maximum best. There is no price on the land, which would be a constraint on where to locate one's hp house. Therefore, people, felt free to move back and forth ~~some~~ to get the best without really considering the overall structure of the moshav.

What I am trying to say is in a case where there are not lots defined ahead of time, is the rule "place the building so that it contributes the most to the creation of public space" enough. Is it a strong incentive for the people to place their house only according to this consideration? As we have seen privacy, proximity, views, ~~public~~ proximity to public buildings was another factor that influenced them a lot,. They considered them more than the contribution to the public spece. And anyway, generally people in the case of the moshav were considerate, they took the public space rather seriously in most cases. There was no major damage because of this. But, it needs a lot of discussion and effort to persuade people on what is the right thing to do as far as the formation of the public space concerns.

Is there any additional rule that would make easier the location of individual houses to contribute to the formation of public space, when lots are y undefined. Any way that was a particular feature of the moshav, because of its social structure, and its financing structure. It happens rea rarely in common cases. However, it is an interesting proble. Location of a house in such a way as to contribute the most to the formation of common public space should not contradict and be in conflict with p personal desires. What to do about i\$?

The families were asked through the rules to contribute to the formation of the common land of the cluster, and to create centers, major, minor in it, beautiful places, to make it real, alive, pleasant.

Before the layout of the house started the family had to do some things in the common land.

Very few families were effective. Some proposed things, but I am not certain they were real. I had the feeling that they did so because they were asked, to do so.

This was one of the major problems of the layout. Anyway, things about the cluster were known beforehand in a general way. ~~By~~ Families had to make them real through small acts. Amy and Nahman proposed something, a trellis and a bicycle and tool shed. On the upper cluster there was a suggestion about a outdoors barbeque place. On Andy's cluster somebody proposed a bench. However, ~~nothing~~ few things were real.

Probably, the time was not appropriate for these kind of things. People were more concerned with their houses. Probably that was difficult, especially to see the relationship between this and the layout of the private house.

The thing that the families did successfully, after a lot of effort from my side, was to define the boundaries of their garden walls, and therefore to define the boundary between private and common land.

We asked each family to propose something independently from the other family, and to put a stake on the ground and define

Public space

what the thing was. Very few stakes were placed like this. I am not certain this is the right approach and the right time for something like this. People were anxious to get their houses straight. T

After the families completed the layout of their house and I felt more relaxed, and after I had realized that not enough had been accomplished on this direction, I asked the families of each cluster to get together on the site and decide about their common land. Some groups did it. Not with real enthusiasm really. Some were more active. Some did not participate.

But even the fact that the families became conscious of the fact that the houses contributed to the formation of the common land through the walls of the garden and the house, and that this had to be nice and articulate was a big step forward

And we should not forget that a lot of these things ~~were~~ concerning the common land were defined on a general way before hand. ~~But~~ The only way it progressed was that the shape of the common land of the cluster was successful in most cases. Beyond this nothing strong happen. I repeat, probably the time was wrong for something like this. Probably the rules???? I don't know. The question is if it is an important part of the

The question is if the public staff layout on such a detail is an important part of the layout process at this time, and if so, how to make it more effective. C Does it have a general applicability and validity for all layout processes for individual houses

The formation of urban positive space in the common land of the cluster

- how did the rules helped on it. Layout of house together with layout of urban space
- how successful it was. Weak points
- concerns about distances. Not part of the rules. Positive or negative.
- no lot definition. Advantages, disadvantages
- a step process. Initial indications of public space together with layout of the whole moshav. Shaping together with houses. Is there any positive element in it.
- conflicts between the needs of the space itself and the needs of the people. Does a conflict like this really exist or is it an intellectual construct.

- compromise.

The importance of the volumes on the layout process. It comes rather early in the layout process. It establishes the major center of the house as a whole.

The families defined the volumes ~~as~~ only in the ground. The height of the volumes ~~where~~ was not completely clear at the time of the layout. Probably the highest of the volumes, and this not in all cases. It was worked out afterwards.

volume
The idea was that each house has a major volume. That was not followed. Probably it was complicate. Probably it did not fit the functional needs of the families.

Anyway at this point I do not know how do judge the volumetric configuration of the houses, as distinct units each one of them, and as a whole.

It is a rather complicate question that needs clear answer. I have the feeling that it has produced more complexity for a small house of 74sq.mt. and an unnecessary complexity for the whole settlement. It needs careful thought this matter. And also how this could be better. How ~~we~~ should we deal with this matter in the next project.

~~The role of the architect in the layout~~

- ~~• Simplicity of rules~~
- ~~• where does the layout of the house start~~
- ~~• the rules work within specific limits; The limit of constraints of the rules. Location, cluster, cluster shape known.~~

The use of the rules for the family started after the location of each house within the settlement had been fixed, and more important than this, after its relationship with the cluster had been defined.

It is a major part of the architect's role to define the relationship between houses. Or, the formation of centers in public space through houses. Then, what did we ask specifically from the families in the first part of the rules? To make the clusters and their common land ~~ax~~ livable places.

There is no layout of a house, without the house defining its precise relationship with the world that surrounds it.

Where does the layout of any house should start?

The role of the architect in the layout of the houses by the families. Did I influence them. Did I give them good advice? Was I really helpful?

Is the layout process of the house by the families a time-efficient method. Two houses per day.

And then there is the time spent to develop the rules. Long and difficult task.

In the beginning the rules were very restrictive, because they defined the relationships between rooms in the house, and the relationship between rooms and gardens in a confining way.

The problem of the garden. One front garden, two gardens, frnt garden back garden. We had a hard time devloping the rules. Part of the difficulty was due to the fact that there were to clear patterns to be followed . The lack of a coherent pattern language in the Israeli project. What weaknesses did it create?

Sizes as specified in the rules were not kept. Size of volumes, size of rooms were not followed, by the families in the layout. Somehow, I have the feeling that our estimates about sizes of house volumes and size of main room were not realistic from a functional point of view, though they made a lot of sense from the point of view of creating centers. But probably. on a crude way.

The idea of using to kind of stakes, one red to identify the centers in the beginning, and then one set of white to identtify the corners of the rooms, or the boundaries of the centers, was not very successful. It was a probably too long and boring to go twice thriugh the rules, one to identify the centers on the site, and agin through the same rules to define the spces, according to the centers. Anyway, the way the rules are written and the wa way the layout worked or should work operationally as a two-sequence process, was not really correct. The sequence of the steps and what they asked was the same for the twoparts of the process, though each part asked for something else. Perhaps the first part of the process could be much shorter, and more to the point. Anyway, the

Rules themselves

operation

The layout process on the way it was supposed to operate reflected the need for identification of centers on the site; it took it really seriously. Now, that I am thinking back, I think that in the beginning families were following this two-sequence process, but probably not for all the steps.

One indication that families did not use stakes for this was that half of the stakes we order remained unused.

Anyway, the idea of the red and white stakes was not very good, it did not really work. Probably it was not explained well.

However, the idea to identify the centers of the house and the common land was very good. But, I do not think that the placement of one stake there has accomplished the task.

Why the process of house layout by the family through the rules was used?

- does it make the houses better when you have to design a large number of houses and you don't want to make all of them the same; but still you want a variety that is not contrived, that does not come out of one mind. And this is difficult to be achieved by one architect. The problem in making housing in large numbers today, even 10 houses, is that even if we realize that they should not be the same but different, for obvious reasons discussed in another place, but that they should be different one from the other, then we get into another problem. How to make houses different one from the other.

*the need
for this
process*

This is a tough problem. How ~~does~~ is variety generated today in a large number of houses that will be built by one

One approach is to reduce variety in types; what architects are doing today. Types correspond mainly to size of families. So, one reason to involve the families in the layout is for the sake of variety. One architect cannot produce it to seem alive and real, and puts the families to do so. It There is something strange in this explanation. The involvement of the families in the layout is done for the sake of the architect or for the sake of the families. I can argue for the second. The family knows its needs better, better than the architect, and can put them to work together better than an architect, given a guidance. The truth of this statement is doubtful. An architect can design a house, find the connections and relationships between rooms on a better and more efficient way than a family.

Actually, if an architect makes the decision that on a housing project he does not want to have the same house all over, and also that he does not want to use house types, but that he wants each house to be unique and geniously different from the other ones, then there are two solutions:

- either he has to spent an enormous amount of time to design each house, as he does for every single house project
- or he will have the families do it under ~~ix~~ his guidance.

The first is too expensive. The second is feasible. The Israeli project has showed it. It is economically feasible for 20 houses.

It is operationally feasible for 20 houses, also.

The reasons for the involvement of the families in the house layout will have to be discussed thoroughly.

What unifies the different houses. What makes the different houses to be and to create a unified whole.

Probably a weak point in the Israeli houses; I am not so sure actually.

the site & configuration of house
not compatible

① Short description of the layout process of the house

- the family is laying out its own house on the basis of a set of rules on the actual site
- before the families start the layout they know the cluster they belong to, and the approximate location of the house in the cluster.

what do they aim at
 ② Why the house layout process by the families is important; to what does it contribute; what does it improve.

*why do we introduce them
 what is their goal
 what do we want to achieve through them*

③ The rules for house layout process and their guiding principles

- *step by step process; hierarchy.*
- create centers; centering and rules
- the formation of the common land of the cluster together with the house layout; the embellishment of the common land
- the actual location of the house and the garden on the site
- the definition of the house volume

for this the layout plan of the whole mashrafi was weak from this respect

④ How did the rules work for house layout work and where implemented by the family; were they used as expected.

~~implemented, did they expect, what was expected, weak and~~
~~strong aspects of the rules~~

- Level of understanding of the rules by the families
- Did the families follow the rules on the house layout or not; how much really?
- The part of the rules concerning the layout of the common land. How did the families deal with it?
- The role of the architect.
- Time spent

6

The assessment of the rules

- The weaknesses and strong aspects

too complicate

not right sequence of the steps - big centers, small center, public-private.

too strongly connected with theory

they ask for details of house layout (big & small centers)

they consider the house as part of a larger context

too long, red and white stakes.

too restrictive

they neglected aspects of family needs?????

- conflict between ~~the~~ ^{weak volumes.} need ~~for~~ ^{good volumes.} ~~the~~ formation of a positive common land and the needs of the individual families.

- patterns and rules; no strong relationship

(too small house for such a complicate configuration in size of house & configuration)

(centers)

7

What was specific about the Israeli rules; What has a general validity and applicability.

The specific aspects: ~~the~~ lot definition follows house layout
the families
the community

The general aspects:

and particular

8

How were the rules developed; what did influence them, or should?

- The role of patterns on the development of the rules.
- The role of the site on the development of rules
- The knowledge of the overall scheme ~~before~~ before the development of the rules.

- Assessment

① What did the rules produce? Assessment of the level of success

Did the rules achieved to produce a coherent whole and settlement.

Yes, but too cute & heavy.

The degree of individuality expressed in each house is the d
desirable one or not.

② The houses as laid out; preliminary drawings and the definition
of the volumetric configuration of the house. Elevations.

Changes after the preliminary; Talks with families again;

Discussion with G.K. The Working drawings.

From the layout of the house on the site to the beginning of
the construction., or to the acquire aquisition of the permit.

One of the most important features of the ~~pre~~ design process for the settlement was the layout process for the individual houses. Each individual house was laid out on the actual site by the family on the basis of a specific set of rules developed by CES for this particular purpose.

Each family spent one to two days on the site laying out its house on a step by step process defined on a set of rules.

Why is it important

What is the significance and the importance of the house layout process by the family, as it was specified in the Israeli project?

Before I go on in explaining the details of the house layout process, its accomplishments and weaknesses, I will try to explain why this part of the design and building process is a very important and significant part of the house production process. And then I will try to state more precisely what we were really aiming at through this process in the Israeli project.

~~xx~~ In Israel we wanted to ~~produce~~ make the

One of the basic goals of the project was to build twenty houses for the first families, who were already identified. (18 out of 20). The usual practice in the design of the settlements in Israel was and is to provide for the families types of houses the same house placed on different ways on the site, or types of houses depending on the size of the family.

The problem with this kind of housing is that in the newly established moshavs they create a sterile and alienated environment. because of the repetition of the same element regardless of different location and different family needs. On the older moshavs, after the families have been settled in the place for some years there is a substantial improvement in their environment, and the place starts to ~~acquire the~~ be differentiated and acquire personal and individual character, since each family does something in front of their house, they plant trees, flowers. And slowly some extensions and changes in the houses take place. But even this is not an easy process since the h

houses are far away, the construction is not easy and probably costly to get builders in the remote moshavs, and probably because the real owner of the houses is the state, who is financing the houses, and want the houses as unpersonal as possible to be adapted to any family needs. What a fault.

~~The first reason~~

The major goal was to make the houses fit the particular individual needs for each family. Therefore, participation of the family on the design of the house to a considerable degree. The family designs the house. This could attribute to each house a feeling a individuality, uniqueness, personal character.

However, all the houses together had to structure a coherent whole. A community with a strong character, a moshav where the feeling of community is strong. Each individual family is unique but also an unseparated part of the moshav. It makes it. The same for the houses. Each one should be different from the other, but not ~~an~~ on an excessive way. There should be features in the houses that would make them belong into the same settlement, the same larger entity. Social cause and need. And also physical cause and need.

This requirement made us think that something was necessary to guide the families in the ~~ad~~ design of the individual houses, that would give them enough freedom to express their individual needs and dreams and at the same time restrict them within specific limits of freedom, so that ~~was~~ what was going to be produced would be coherent, part of a larger whole, both in social and physical terms. Therefore, we had to set the limits of variation ~~and~~ that each family was allowed to express.

Beyond this we knew that it was impossible to design each house as a custom house. To spend with each family weeks or months to design ~~xx~~ each house as usually is being done with single family houses designed by an architect together with the family. That was economically not feasible. The limits of the contract and the reality of projects where a large volume of housing was to be produced on an economical way, since ~~xxxx~~ they are "mass produced" houses. The time and therefore the fees for architectural services would be too high to compete with the regular way of one-type or two-types housing development, in which the time spent to develop one or two houses as types is rather short compared with designing twenty different houses.

The possibility of us designing twenty different houses, without the families was not possible. Not only because as a matter of principle was contrary to the first idea, but also because the variation that would come from one or two people designing twenty different houses, even after discussing with them would be a contrived variation. And we wanted to avoid this faulty and contrived variety of houses.

Also, we knew that families are not well trained and experienced to design houses. By asking them without any guidance ~~and~~ to do something like this would probably create a chaotic situation. Therefore, the process had to be well-structured.

Therefore, because of all these reasons, we came to the conclusion that we had to develop a set of rules, as a basis for the design of all houses. Each family should have to follow this set of rules to lay out its house.

Also, we knew the site. It was a special site, with a lot of variation, specific places, trees, views, slopes. A beautiful and difficult site. Therefore, although each family knew the approximate location of its house before hand from the time of the layout of the whole moshav , we knew that for the houses to be really part of the site, to sit there on a way that would respect the structure of the existing site, and still enhance its structure, the layout had to happen on the site . Also, we knew that the particularity of the site, the different orientations of the houses, the different possible views.... would contribute to create a geniune variatio and varieyt among the houses, which would not happen if the houses were not laid on the site. Also, the different physical context of each house, different cluster, could attribute the necessary variety to the house.

The reasons:

-

Therefore, we developed a set of rules;:

1. The rules provided for a step by step procee that a famil y had to follow to lay out the house.
2. The structure of the process was hierarchical. It started with the establishment of the major things, and went on to smaller things. You know what you have to pay attention to at each point, you do not loose control and understanding of the process. You know exactly what you have accomplished. You know why things are the way they are.....
3. We established through the rules a basic set of similarities, structural similarities, similarities like patterns for each house. We did not develop specifically a set of patterns fo for the project. Too difficult , too complicate for an Israeli settlement that sits among arab villages. They do not have still a clear pattern language from which we could have based our suggestions. Therefore, we were loose in it. The similar generic features we introduced through the rules were based on the relationship of each house to the cluster it beloned to, the volumetric configuration of the house, emphasis on a main big room in each house, of about 1/3 of the whole house, Relationships between rooms, garden, private outdoor places, like porch, veranda, staircase. potentially
4. However, the introduced similarities were of such nature that would permit each family to vary its house according to its specific needs, according to each relationship to the cluster, according to the specific site, view, .
5. The major intention of the rules was to try to communicate to the families the idea of a "center". What it is, how it should be done. The intention was to create a sequence of

of centers, starting from the bigger and most important centers.

The hierarchy of centers according to which the house should have been laid out was specified in the rules. ~~XXXXXXX~~

The sequence was garden, house position- house volume- front entrance- main room- main room center- main room windows- window alcove- entrance room- kitchen- kitchen table- warm winter terrace- bedrooms cool summer windroom- master bedroom- master bedroom alcove- childrens playroom- childrens sleeping alcoves.....

Some of them where the major centers; like ~~main~~ main room, garden..... Then immediately after the introduction of one major center the smaller centers that would contribute to the formation of the bigger center were introduced.

Therefore the introduction of centers was; larger centers (garden & house volume), smaller centers (entrance, main room, kitchen) even smaller centers(.....).

The sequence of the introduction of the centers during the layout process? It needs assessment.

6. Another major goal of the rules was to shape the common land of the cluster together with the layout of the house. The house was described in the beginning as a continuation of the public places of the moshav, main square, main path, secondary paths

Ø Layout of centers of common land and public spaces was interwoven with the first steps of house layout. It became clear that the location of the house will contribute to the formation of the common land, that garden, garden wall, house position, garden gate, entrance, volumes, all these steps of house layout were critical and essential to the layout of the common land.

In the beginning of the layout process there was an interchange of layout acts between house itself and common land,. It was clear h that one could not exist without the other.

Also, the establishment of the overall shape and location of the house before the specificities of its interior layout were known, is an unconventional way of house design, but necessary to the formation of the possitive outdoor space.

7. Therefore, the shape and position and volumetric configuration of the house was one of the very first steps, to be accomplished as a way to define and contribute to the formation of common land, to make it positive, ~~and~~ a major center, and not to create it in an additive way after layout acts for specific room. Overall shape and volume comes first without knowing what is inside. Reasons: you know the bigger centers first, in realtionship to its surrounding, ~~than~~ then you embellish it with smaller centers. Also, because of shaping of common land. What are the needs of the common land? What boundaries does it need? How the house should be shaped to respond to it on the most appropriate way. And at the same time the house has to have good shape, be a center.....

~~XXXXXXXX~~ Priorities among the families varied; for some the need for separate bedrooms for each child influenced to a considerable degree the layout of their house by trying to arrange three or four bedrooms in a small house; (Nahman). Others were more relaxed about this issue, and they solved the problem by providing a big ~~childroom~~ bedroom for their children, often with defined bed alcoves (Alper). Therefore, the rules although the provided for a well structured framework within which each family operated, they allowed ~~for~~ each family to pass its aspirations ~~and needs~~ through them and to adapt them to its particular needs.

However, what is particularly interesting to discuss is how the families dealt with the layout of the house ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX with respect to its guiding principle of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX structuring the house as a field of centers.

There was one family, the Ezers, who did not pay any attention to it. They prepared a plan ~~in~~ at home, probably after going through the rules, and then Oded came on the site and put stakes on the ground by following exactly the plan. They had violated the major aspect of the centering process; that ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ^{the making} of ~~make~~ something that is a center ~~it~~ can not be accomplished successfully unless ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ^{physical} its actual context is taken seriously into consideration. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Although he knew the site ~~was~~ of the house, and the house cluster, by doing the plan of the house away from the site, he failed to take the best advantage of it, in terms of its views, ~~and~~ ^{the} local slopes and its relationships to the rest of the cluster. The house is not well connected with the cluster as a whole. And beyond this, as a house in

The families followed the rules in the layout process; they looked at them from their own perspective, they interpreted them ~~xxxxxxx~~ according to their own needs, they gave to them feeling and life. Some families made the main center of their house the front garden by embracing it by the house and enclosing it by the garden wall, others laid out the house in such a way as to focus the ~~energy of~~ ^(Bell-Kliglers) energy of ~~in~~ in the house ~~to~~ the kitchen, ~~xxxxxx~~ (Ragol), the majority, anyway, made the living room the center of the house. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ A number of families gave a specific importance to the activity of eating, and therefore they provided a separate dining room, unlike others that incorporated this activity either in a big kitchen or in the living room.

were
How ~~did~~ the rules received by the families, how they were used,
understood.

Each family spend one to two days on the site to lay out its house. Usually both, the wife and the husband participated on the layout of the house. Each family had read the rules before hand to understand the concepts described in it. Also, each one had a rough idea of how they wanted to distribute the 74sq,mt. of the house in the different rooms.

Before the actual layout process of the house had taken place on the site, the family already had chosen the ~~at~~ the cluster where they would be living, as well as the approximate location of their house within the house.

~~It~~ there are three ways according to which we can judge at this point the level of understanding of the rules by the families, how useful they were.

1. from their attitude and the way they operated on the site.
2. from the results ~~of~~ shown in the plans of the houses and the cluster.

There were two extreme attitudes that the families took on the house layout process: families who really without any preconception about the form and shape of their house, came on the site, being enthusiastic and happy, Roudmans, Bell-Kliglers, Nahman, Amy. They made a real an ingenious effort to understand the site, the needs of the cluster, and the followed the rules step by step. ~~They put~~ they put a lot of feeling into their houses, and actually this can be seen clearly on the plans of the houses they had produced.

The other extreme was families, actual one, Ezers, who had prepared a plan at home and they put it on the ground. For sure the family knew the site, but even so, ~~the house~~ there is something from this house.

Most of the families also did the layout of the house really on the site. But, I think they came with preconceptions, mainly coming from the houses they were living before. These preconceptions were really expressed clearly to me during the process of the layout; like # "I want a sunken living room", (Schtulman), or "I want a counter between the kitchen and the living room" Hammer also. (Rosenfeld). In other cases the preconceptions were not really expressed in this way, but it can be recognized in some plans which carry strong images from typical houses.

Did the families understand the idea of the "center", and did they carry it successfully.

People used this word a lot while laying out their houses. However, the only way to judge it is from the plans. Some plans are very successful on this respect. Nahman, introduces a big family room-kitchen around which the rooms of ~~ix~~house open into. Probably a simplistic approach, but a strong act. Amy was more sophisticated. In Amy's house we can see more that the centers do not stay on the big level, on the big scale. In the house there are centers on different levels of scale, relationships between rooms, windows, doors. The garden a strong center, kitchen, living room.....(Both of these families gave to me very detailed plans of their houses, they themselves kept a detailed record of the layout and afterwards thought and worked on it, without changing what had been defined on

the site, but they worked on the details of their houses.
Bell-Kligers house is very successful also in terms of its centers,.
The garden, and the house in relationship to it, the articulation
of the volumes, the living with the alcove and the porch off
from it, the corridor with the windows.....

In some other houses the identification and making of centers
is more crude. They are there on a crude way.(Gilford), or
they are there on a subdued way but not fully developed (Ornstein),

The making of the common land by the families

The point that the families understood the best was that they
had to shape the garden and the overall configuration of
the house in such a way as to contribute the most to the formation
of the common land, as a whole, and to the formation of small
places in it. My participation on this step of the process was
the maximum. I wanted to make sure that this step was to work
successfully, and I could see some problems that the families
had; mainly problems of proximity between houses and privacy
in the garden and the house. A lot of effort was put from my
side into understanding the need for a garden wall. Most of
the families coming from US. and Canada were used to front
lawns without physical definition, and therefore they wanted
the same treatment there, that; this could not be very successful
in that specific case, first because of the attitude people
have towards defining clearly their garden, both in the Israeli
and Arab parts of Israel, and also because the definition of
the common land could not have been successful unless the garden

played an important role on the definition of its boundaries, since the frontage of the available houses was not enough to define the public space, and since the houses were detached, because on what the site suggested and because of the wishes of the families. (Also that would add to the cost; they were very considerate and cautious)

Anyway, that was not a difficult issue; it was discussed separately with each family, each one understood for this its specific case the need for the garden wall and the garden.

The issue of proximity between houses, and the issue of view for each house was important too. In the rules we did not specify any minimum ~~a~~ or maximum distances between houses. We can say there was a conflict in some cases; between the needs for creating a positive outdoor space for the common land of the cluster with the best size and shape, and the need for the desirable distance between houses. Whenever this issue would come up there was a discussion with the family. The idea was to try to communicate to them the importance of their house location to the public space. e.g. Nahman and Amy, Slyper and Roudman, Ragol and Olman. In most cases the issue was resolved successfully, without any bad feelings, without feeling ~~xx~~ of compromise. Looking at the clusters and the position of the houses in relationship to it and to each other, there is a positive feeling that comes from their location. Some could be more respectful of the common land, but actually that was the best way to solve all problems involved in the house and garden location.

The families were less creative on the more precise definition of the common land, of its main and secondary centers on an explicit way, on the definition of its actual places of what exactly is taking place there. Beyond that they managed to form the boundaries of the common land they did not go beyond this. Amy's attempt on a piece of paper successful.
Hammer cluster sketch.

Probably it was too much to ask from the families.
Probably they came early in the layout process and the families were anxious to go on with the house layout itself.
Probably it was too complicate to conceive.
Also, they felt it was not a matter of an individual but of all the families in the cluster. Yet, it is not so easy to bring four five families to agree on something.

Understanding of volumes. They defined volumes as plans. Not as volumes. Amy, Eyton exceptions.

was manifested by
The strongest weakness that most of the families ~~showed~~ in the
layout process was their involvement and contribution in
~~the~~ defining the character of their house cluster in some
detail. The families did not have any particular problem,
besides what was discussed before, with respect to the ^{overall} definition
of the public areas of their house cluster, like the main path
and wher it enters the house cluster, or the area of the common
land of the cluster. However, they did the minimum in defining
the smaller centers in their house cluster, how its places would
look like, what kind of activities would take place, and what
would be needed in terms of spacial arrangements ~~and~~ so that
these activities would be sustained and enhanced. It seems
to me that they channeled all their emphasis in the layout of
their house; and the definition of the public areas of the
house cluster was done rather successfully since that was
strongly interconnected with the layout of the house itself.
They had to define precisely the boundaries between the common
land of the cluster and their house and garden, in order to
define the location of their house. However, when they reached
the rules about the main center of the common land or about
the smaller centers ~~they then~~ there was a tendancy to go through
them in haste, by putting some stakes on the ground without
really meaning. I had suspected that the reason for this was

that the families were really anxious in getting their house
laid out, and therefore after the families had completed the
layout of their house I suggested another working session on
the site cluster by cluster, ~~so~~ ^{all} so that they would have the c
chance to think more precisely about the character and feeling
of their house cluster as they did about their house. Most of
the families, ~~in~~ grouped according to their clusters, went on
the site; something more was accomplished there, but not
much. The families did not put themselves into it, although
they suggested different things, rather sensible most of the
time; probably the time was not mature enough to get into
such details about the ~~xxxxxx~~ house cluster as a whole. But
still it was necessary. One or two individuals were really ~~a~~
active, like Amy and Eytan, and they did the most of what has
been accomplished in their clusters.

SSYPER: He did not want ot pay attention while locating his house to the view terrace next to it. The angle in his house was made because of this, and after lengthy di discussions on the site. But finally he did not understand it.

I helped him and his wife on the layout, especially on the location of the house, and the volumetric configuaration of the house.

He ~~xxxxxx~~ had established the major centers of the house, while I visited him on the site. I helped him to relate and connect them. Also, the placement of the balcony was my suggestion. ~~He~~ I explained to him how it would make the living room much better place. It would contribute to make it a better center. He understood it and was happy to have a balcony in the house. The same with alcove in the bedroom.