e.N.U.P.H.

[efficient new urban phoenix housing]

Matt Troia
iiT M.Arch Candidate 2012
Master’s Project; May 2012
Adviser: George Schipporeit
Dedicated to my parents:

Thank you so much for allowing me to pursue my interests and encouraging me on my endeavors, no matter how discouraged I became... I never could have accomplished any of this without you. I love you and am forever grateful for your support.

-Matt
CONTENTS

PART [1] RESEARCH [GRAPHIC ARGUMENT]  
1 - 29

PART [2] PROCESS  
31 - 43

PART [3] FINAL PROJECT  
45 - 61

REFERENCES [BIBLIOGRAPHY]  
63 - 64
PART ONE (1/3)

RESEARCH
Phoenix grew 12,777% from 1910 - 2010

That’s an average growth rate of 127% per year...

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
...IN SPRAWL

### POPULATION, AREA, DENSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1,445,632</td>
<td>517.95</td>
<td>3,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan, NYC</td>
<td>1,585,873</td>
<td>22.96</td>
<td>70,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>617,594</td>
<td>89.63</td>
<td>12,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2,695,598</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>11,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>805,235</td>
<td>231.89</td>
<td>17,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

In addition...

40% of Phoenix HOME SALES in 2010 were FORECLOSURES partly due to increased strain on transportation spending

Source: W.P. Carey School of Business, www.bundle.com

In car-related expenses per Arizona household per year $7,091
So how can Phoenix grow responsibly without taking up new land?

...... [It begins with housing]

Efficient New Urban Phoenix Housing [e.N.U.P.H.]

A new, mixed-use housing typology catered to Phoenix

- Neighborhood-centered
- Reduced utility costs
- Access to public transportation
- Mixed-use...with privacy
- Ecologically responsible
- Attractive

No privacy
Not attractive to Phoenicians
Massive capital required
Too crowded

Inefficient
Automobile expense
Wasted commute time
Expensive utilities

Ecologically responsible
Attractive
E.N.U.P.H.
The dream is collapsing!

I know! I can’t afford a house anymore! Is the American dream still alive?

The Dream is Collapsing

How truly attainable is the AMERICAN DREAM in Phoenix during an era of persistent unemployment, economic stagnation, foreclosure epidemic, rising cost of credit?
Long commutes & a bad market make living in the newer outskirts of Phoenix more and more EXPENSIVE.

“As drive ‘till you qualify’ - Phoenix realty saying

As expected, used homes closer to the city center are more affordable than new suburban tract homes.

2011 Phoenix Housing Affordability Index

A number below 100 means that a family is spending more than 50% of its household income on housing.

A number below 200 means that a family is spending just over 25% of its household income on housing, a healthy figure according to financial analysts.

Source: ASU W.P. Carey School of Business Realty Studies, 2011.
Resources for the Future

only 8mm of rain falls on average in Phoenix each YEAR...

and with about 3,761,859 VEHICLES on the road in the city, gasoline use is at an all-time high.

Sources: www.wikipedia.org, Arizona Department of Transportation
Long commutes = from the suburbs into downtown Phoenix

MORE EMISSIONS & USE OF RESOURCES

CO2 PER ACRE FROM HOUSEHOLD AUTO USE

- Data not available
- Less than 6 metric tons/acre
- 6 to 14 metric tons/acre
- 14 to 20 metric tons/acre
- 20 to 30 metric tons/acre
- 30 metric tons/acre and greater

CO2 PER HOUSEHOLD FROM HOUSEHOLD AUTO USE

- Data not available
- Less than 3.3 metric tons/HH
- 3.3 to 5.1 metric tons/HH
- 5.1 to 6.5 metric tons/HH
- 6.5 to 8.6 metric tons/HH
- 8.6 metric tons and greater

Source: True Affordability and Location Efficiency, H+T Affordability Index

e.N.U.P.H.

- Efficient
- Inefficient

A walkable environment results in not just healthier residents, but an overall decrease in emissions and use of resources. Both WATER and FUEL usage will decrease as residents move from single family homes to mixed-use developments like e.N.U.P.H.

e.N.U.P.H. can be implemented in both urban and suburban contexts. By focusing on the first tier suburbs outside the urban core, e.N.U.P.H. can help attract people who still want to live outside the main center of Phoenix but who still desire convenient access to the downtown area as well as entertainment and sporting venues.
Courtyard houses, once a common typology in hot, arid regions, are NOT as prevalent in Phoenix as they were, replaced by standard developer-driven homes with the advent of air conditioning.
The courtyard houses and overall urban fabric of the Syrian town of Aleppo provide many interesting insights to Muslim thoughts on housing and cities, as well as offering several examples of how to build responsibly within a hot and arid climate while still providing for individual privacy and quality of life.

A COURTYARD HOUSE IS EFFICIENT IN A HOT, ARID CLIMATE, AND ENABLES INCREASED DENSITY WITHIN A CITY WHILE STILL MAINTAINING PRIVACY FOR ITS RESIDENTS.

Although Aleppo is classified as a semi-arid region and receives approximately 390mm more rain than Phoenix each year, the two cities have similar climate patterns. Studying the effect that the harsh environment of Aleppo has on the courtyard house can help predict how a similar typology would react in Phoenix.

Can Phoenix embrace courtyard housing once again?

Aleppo Phoenix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record high</td>
<td>6388</td>
<td>7092</td>
<td>88100</td>
<td>93105</td>
<td>106114</td>
<td>117122</td>
<td>115121</td>
<td>109116</td>
<td>106116</td>
<td>99107</td>
<td>8696</td>
<td>6487</td>
<td>117122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average high</td>
<td>5047</td>
<td>5570</td>
<td>6477</td>
<td>7585</td>
<td>8485</td>
<td>93104</td>
<td>97106</td>
<td>97104</td>
<td>91100</td>
<td>81108</td>
<td>6675</td>
<td>5466</td>
<td>7586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average low</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>3748</td>
<td>3953</td>
<td>4860</td>
<td>5569</td>
<td>6377</td>
<td>7083</td>
<td>7082</td>
<td>5976</td>
<td>5464</td>
<td>4552</td>
<td>3744</td>
<td>5263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record low</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2835</td>
<td>3239</td>
<td>4849</td>
<td>6163</td>
<td>5958</td>
<td>4547</td>
<td>4134</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Precipitation (mm)

89.91 | 64.92 | 38.98 | 28.27 | 8.11 |
3.02   | 0.05   | 0.00   | 0.64   | 25.58 |
56.64  | 84.88  | 3953

e.N.U.P.H. will be driven by a courtyard typology.
“Urbs in Horto”
[CITY IN A GARDEN]
-Daniel Burnham, Plan of Chicago

Hmm...can an architectural typology breathe life into a city through vegetation and gardens?
Habitat 67 investigates how private outdoor space can still be maintained even in an urban, multifamily development. Built as part of Expo 67 in Montreal, the project was designed to illustrate the new lifestyle people in which people would live in increasingly crowded cities around the world.

EVEN WITHIN DENSE CITIES, PEOPLE CAN STILL HAVE AFFORDABLE HOUSING WITH PRIVATE GARDENS.
The Mountain House, by BIG, explores the typology of combined housing and parking. Located in the Ørestad development south of Copenhagen, the project resembles a mountain sloping towards the southeast, with each unit receiving its own outdoor space and unobstructed views.

PARKING AND HOUSING CAN BE BEAUTIFULLY COMBINED IN A SYMBIOTIC MANNER THAT ENABLES MORE PRIVACY AND OUTDOOR RESOURCES FOR RESIDENTS.
Optima Camelview proves that with the right design and location, many wealthy Arizonans are willing to live in multi-family projects. Located adjacent to the Scottsdale Fashion Square mall, Camelback’s design results in nearly every residence having its own patio or outdoor space. A shared court yard contains a pool and lush vegetation; helping to cool the air while improving the quality of life for residents.

THE PROJECT IS A MULTI-FAMILY MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT CATERING TO UPSCALE CONSUMERS THROUGH THE EMPHASIS ON PRIVATE SPACE AND VEGETATION.
The Country Club Plaza in Kansas City was one of the first outdoor shopping centers in the country which catered to the automobile. Surrounded by mixed-use buildings and residential towers, J.C. Nichols was able to create a bustling and successful ‘mini-town’ outside of the urban core of Kansas City.

The project focuses on the intersection between pedestrians and automobiles, and succeeds in combining multiple uses in a relatively dense area.
Americans are the most *INDIVIDUALISTIC* people in the *WORLD*...

*according to Geert Hofstede*
HOFSTEDE’S CULTURAL DIMENSIONS THEORY

Geert Hofstede, an influential Dutch psychologist and anthropologist, developed the Cultural Dimensions while working for IBM in the 1970’s. With the ability to access extensive amounts of information at IBM, Hofstede began aggregating individuals as societal units, allowing him to examine national cultures rather than individual personalities. He developed six dimensions of values; Equality vs. Inequality, Collectivism vs. Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance vs. Tolerance, Masculinity vs. Femininity, Temporal Orientation, and Indulgence vs. Restraint. While his results are certainly not indicative of every citizen of particular country, anthropologists and international business leaders use these values to assess different cultures and countries as accurately as possible.

10 MOST INDIVIDUALISTIC COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 LEAST INDIVIDUALISTIC COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.clearlycultural.com

So how do you preserve PRIVACY in a collectivistic programmatic organization?

Contemporary American housing model
MOUNTAIN DWELLINGS

Detailed Case Study
Copenhagen, Denmark
B.I.G. Architects
2008

No two sides of the building appear the same. The building slopes up towards the denser city beyond, and reveals its more private, less-obtrusive side to the adjacent neighborhood.

Typical unit plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>NSF</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed unit types</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>103,000 ft²</td>
<td>74,000 ft²</td>
<td>Front doors fed by interior circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior circulation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13,800 ft²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SPACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering space</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,000 ft²</td>
<td>10,500 ft²</td>
<td>These spaces only open to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor space</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>31,000 ft²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>225,000 ft²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various retail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,000 ft²</td>
<td>3,600 ft²</td>
<td>Located on 3 floors around parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000 ft²</td>
<td>5,475 ft²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>397,275 ft²</td>
<td>88,100 ft²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-3 ft² public green space / 1 ft² condo

CASE STUDY PROGRAM: MOUNTAIN DWELLINGS

1. View from southeast
2. Approach from north
3. Interior of garage

1. Beauty Shape
2. Natural Light
3. Plan to Section Relationship

Diagonal circulation path inhabits the interstitial space between parking and housing

Circulation confined to one linear spine

Each floor has a separate entrance from the parking garage

Similar unit plan throughout, variation occurs at corners

Areas for private patios or gardens, open to walkway

Walkway is similar to neighborhood sidewalk, only accessible to units on a particular level

Hedges provide privacy from upper units

Vegetation exposed to greatest amount of sunlight
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In order for **e.N.U.P.H.** to work effectively, **it needs to find a balance** between **PRIVACY & COMMUNITY**.

**Description**

This project is a prototype for an urban mixed-use housing development in Phoenix, Arizona which aims to improve the **quality of life** for its residents by integrating **suburban amenities**, like open space and privacy, into an urban setting.

**Case Statement**

This project will be developed because I have a strong interest in how Phoenix can sustainably grow in the future. Clearly, unchecked sprawl and inefficient dwelling units cannot continue indefinitely, especially in an area where many resources are scarce. However, most people do not move to Phoenix for the city, but for the natural areas outside the city. Many of the high-rise buildings near the urban core are near vacant and empty lots sit like missing teeth in the urban fabric. This project will fill such voids and bring **vitality** back to the city.

Furthermore, I am interested in becoming an architect/developer in Phoenix in the future and would like to approach this project not only from an architectural perspective, but also from a developer’s point of view. If there is a financially-feasible way to create beautiful, efficient, and universally appealing housing stock in urban Phoenix as opposed to new cookie-cutter developments far outside the city, it could help reduce the amount of sprawling tract homes and arguably create a better quality of life for all residents.
GOALS

Typology for a New American Dream
Individuals living in the mixed-use project and people within the city will be inspired by the development and residents, in particular, will feel a sense of place.

Alternative for Suburbanites
This idea will be successful by celebrating suburban amenities in existing urban conditions, leading to a better quality of life for residents and more affordable housing without sacrificing conveniences.

Catalyst for Sustainable Growth
This idea will be successful by celebrating suburban amenities in existing urban conditions, leading to a better quality of life for residents without sacrificing conveniences.

Stitch Ruptured Urban Fabric
This idea will help remedy the tearing of the urban fabric in Phoenix by encouraging reestablishment of urban vitality.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Creating and Maintaining Identity
Individuals living in the mixed-use project and people within the city will be inspired by the development and residents, in particular, will feel a sense of place.

Community Establishment
Creating community among individuals who value their privacy but also want to engage in social interaction should be considered in all decisions.

Urban Revitalization
The project will give back to the City of Phoenix by revitalizing the static urban conditions that currently exist through the influx of additional residents and needed program(s).

Ecologically-Responsible
The project should acknowledge its location in a warm through all design decisions, and leave a positive mark on the local environment.

Better Quality of Life
All decisions made on the project should result in at least an equal or better quality of life for residents than suburban living.
STAKEHOLDERS

Homeowners
These are the people who will actually live in the mixed-use development and contribute to its success.

Developer
The individual(s) responsible for the actual manifestation of the project; stands to benefit or lose financially.

Phoenix City Government
The government will be interested in how the project not only improves the quality of life for people living in the development, but also how it improves the urban fabric of the city in general; also interested in additional tax revenue created from the project.

Banks / investors / Lending Authorities
The agencies that provide funding to the developer to actually get the project built; they are interested in profits from their investment.
View of site from the SE corner of McClintock & Central
View from rear of site, looking towards the skyline of Downtown Phoenix to the South
Where will all those people live?

The **SUN CORRIDOR** from Phoenix to Tucson is expected to grow by 118% from 2010 to 2050...

Which means a metropolitan area of nearly 12,400,000

Where will all those people live?

e.N.U.P.H. AT AN URBAN SCALE

---

**2010**

*Density: 3,071 people/mi²*

*Population: 4,192,887 (metro)*

*Suggested government-imposed physical boundary to growth*
2020

Density: 4,395 people/mi²
Population: 6,000,000 (metro)

Public transportation extended to desert recreational areas
2035

**Density:** 5,714 people/mi²

**Population:** 7,800,000 (metro)

*Preserve existing green spaces and parks*
2050

Density: 7,326 people/mi²
Population: 10,000,000 (metro)

PRESERVED DESERT ENVIRONMENT

Local economic, recreational, and residential nodes
PART ONE (2/3)

PROCESS
UNIT CONCEPTS:
Maximizing usable space, focusing on outdoor living areas

Typical single-family, detached, suburban tract home

Typical front, side, and back yards
Paving for driveway and sidewalks (if present)

Back porch / outdoor living space
Why does temporarily-used space make up most of a tract home’s plot area?

This is the area that is mostly used by occupants; the interior and exterior living spaces.
Why is there such a disconnect between used and unused space? Can we maximize blue space and minimize red space?
Central courtyard, looking to the northwest
1 Retail Shops
2 Supermarket
3 Fitness center/Spa
4 Restaurant
5 Residential lobby
6 Courtyard
7 Stairs/Amphitheatre
8 Circulation to dayschool
9 Circulation to offices
10 Mechanical
11 Open to parking below
12 Ramps to parking
13 Light rail station
14 Phoenix Art Museum

Ground Level Plan
Level 3 Plan:

1. Offices
2. Dayschool
3. Dayschool outdoor play area
4. Pool & Sun deck
5. Residential amenities deck
6. Hot tub
7. Walkway (above & below)

Level 8 Plan:
Entrance to the courtyard through the corner plaza on McClintock & Central, sculptural lighting elements
Dusk view into courtyard and towards downtown from penthouse patio; public events in courtyard
RESIDENTIAL CONCEPT

In order to provide an alternative to suburban sprawl living which entices with its offer of outdoor space, all units have extensive outdoor living areas equaling at least 20% of the interior area. These large outdoor areas can be opened up to the interior of the units through sliding glass doors to enjoy the pleasant Phoenix weather and people watch in the courtyard below.
IRONWOOD

Indoor Area: 1,225 ft²
Outdoor Area: 220 ft²
AGAVE
Indoor Area: 1,900 ft²
Outdoor Area: 460 ft²
PALO VERDE

Indoor Area: 1,900 ft²
Outdoor Area: 490 ft²
THE SAGUARO

Indoor Area: 4,000 ft²
Outdoor Area: 1,380 ft²
Amenities deck located on level 8; looking towards mountains to the southeast
REFERENCES

IN PRINT


This book contains many examples of Alvar Aalto’s work as well as essays which evaluate his synthesis of architecture and landscape. As I will be working toward a certain architectural typology that works well in the desert with regards to sustainability and comfort, I plan to study the ways that Aalto was successful in linking these issues together through his architecture.


This book examines the underlying environmental issues, such as water, energy, and habitat, with regards to building in warm, arid climates. It also touches on cultural issues such as how to design for a thriving desert community and historical settlement patterns. Most importantly, it offers suggestions to improve sustainability when building in the desert. This will be a valuable resource as I begin to develop sustainable methods to apply to an architectural typology.


This book carefully studies the organization and composition of many ancient Islamic cities, which share a very similar climate to Phoenix. A study of ancient architectural typologies, mainly courtyard-focused, can also be found in this book, which explains why these types of houses were desirable for residents in terms of engaging society, tightening the urban fabric, and maintain privacy. Some of these typologies also include examples of courtyard housing coupled with mixed-use, something I’m very interested in studying for the Phoenix area.


This book explains the growth phenomenon experienced in Phoenix and the resulting suburban sprawl. It focuses mainly on Cave Creek, a suburb of Phoenix, and lists reasons why suburban typologies have continued to enjoy popularity even at the expense of the environment. As I’m interested in studying how more urban architectural typologies could be made desirable for people in the suburbs, this resource should come in handy to understand the deep-seeded roots of suburbanization and sprawl in this area.


This article in Foreign Policy discusses some of the lies of cities and benefits of suburbs. For example, Kotkin notes that city-dwellers typically use more energy per capita than their suburban counterparts. The article also examines the underlying economic concerns behind increasing urban density and compares the quality of life those in the city and those in the suburbs. This resource will be particularly important because I plan on studying why cities are supposedly better than suburbs and how suburban quality of life can still be maintained within an urban setting.


This book analyses dozens of multi-family residential projects around the world and categorizes them by type, location, cost per square foot, density, funding, and target residents. Typologies include mid-rise buildings as well as townhouse-type attached residences. This resource will be valuable to my project because one of the end goals will be designing an architectural typology that is not only appropriate for a desert environment, but is also economically feasible, issues which are well-addressed in the book.


Typology += Innovative Residential Architecture looks at multiple examples of mixed-use and multi-family housing across the globe, focusing primarily on unit design and planning. I plan to use this book in addition to D Book for inspiration in developing unit plans and overall unit composition.

ONLINE

REFERENCE

www.wsj.com [Wall Street Journal]
Websites for referencing recent real estate movement and trends

www.knowledge.wpcarey.asu.edu [ASU’s W.P. Carey School of Business]
Reference site with specific information on Phoenix-area real estate

www.bundle.com [Partner with MSN Money]
Popular personal finance website with relevant segments on real estate, home ownership, and renting

ONLINE

DESIGN INSPIRATION

www.bundle.com [Partner with MSN Money]
www.jonesstudioinc.com [Jones Studio, Phoenix architects]
www.baumschlager-eberle.com [Baumschlager Eberle Architekten]
www.willbruder.com [Will Bruder, Phoenix architect]
www.s-ehrlich.com [Steven Ehrlich Architects]
www.jonesstudioinc.com [Jones Studio, Phoenix architects]
www.behnisch.com [Behnisch Architekten]
www.bundle.com [Partner with MSN Money]
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