

Integral open building design methodology

Citation for published version (APA):

Zeiler, W., Savanovic, P., & Quanjel, E. M. C. J. (2009). Integral open building design methodology. In R. Vehler, M. Verhoeven, & M. Fremouw (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd CIB International conference on Smart and Sustainable Built Environments (SASBE2009), June 15-19 2009, Delft* (pp. 1-9)

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2009

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

INTEGRAL OPEN BUILDING DESIGN METHODOLOGY

Wim ZEILER¹
Perica SAVANOVIC¹
Emile QUANJEL¹



Keywords: *integral design, sustainability, industry*

Abstract

There is a growing awareness of sustainability that leads towards knowledge transfer and research between companies and the Dutch knowledge and research institutes within the building industry. The principles of the IFD (Industrial Flexible Dismountable) concept aim at an integrated approach within the design process to reach a maximum level of integration between designers from different disciplines. A newly developed methodology for structuring integral design processes enables design team support during designing and further stimulates exchange of ideas and concepts. This approach is tested within a professional context of a building design project.

To support architects more effectively with their tasks the domain-independent integral design methodology was developed in the lines with Open building. This specific multi-disciplinary approach helped architecture and engineering. We think that the proposed Integral Design methodology is a possible solution for support of the design team in the conceptual phase of building design.

1. Introduction

Preservation of energy resources, occupant comfort and environmental impact limitation are the key issues of modern and sustainable architecture. A major portion of primary energy consumption, about 40 %, is due to create thermal comfort in buildings by heating, cooling, ventilating and lighting. At each level in the design process different decisions have to be taken. One of those decisions is the application of sustainable energy systems and components. However this is rather complex to integrate in the early stages of building design as many aspects have to be taken into account. During the last decades, the main focus of research in Building Services was on reduction of energy consumption of buildings. The strong focus on energy reduction led to situations in which health and comfort are endangered.

Instead these sustainable energy systems are added during the final design stages. This results in sub optimal solutions and often leads to complete rejection of proposals to use sustainable energy systems at all. At the early design stages, usually only conceptual sketches and schematics are available, often rough and incomplete. Architects tend to develop their designs in a drawing-based, graphical way (prototypes are used to investigate the design concepts). As the design proceeds, more information and detail will be developed.

Lately the design and the making of the built environment have become more complex. There are presently new and stricter demands connected for comfort, durability and sustainability. In the conceptual design phase, in order to create conditions that assure a built environment that gets better, the ingenuity of the whole design team existing of different disciplines should be used, not only architecture. The quality of the

¹ Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, w.zeiler@bwk.tue.nl

team should be combined with a well considered process of the design itself. Techniques are selected and put together by a team in an integral design process. In addition to the application of proven construction methods, the integral approach demands an attitude of openness and appreciation of the other participating disciplines and their positions.

2. Methodology: change of design perspective

At the early design stages, usually only conceptual sketches and schematics are available, often rough and incomplete. Architects tend to develop their designs in a drawing-based, graphical way (prototypes are used to investigate the design concepts). It is important to mention here that (building) design is a creative process based on iteration: it consists of continuous back-and-forth movements as the designer selects from a pool of available components and control options to synthesize the solution within given constraints.

Traditionally the building to be designed takes a central place in thinking of the design team, see fig. 1A (Hasselt et.al 1998). Looking more closely we find that means and goal are mixed up. More and more the insight is growing that it is not the building to be designed that should be central but the needs of the humans for which the building is intended. This leads to a new approach in which the human needs are key aspects that have to be fulfilled, see fig. 1B.




Figure 1 Strategic design (Hasselt et.al. 1998)(A), structure and strategy Integral design (B), the needed balance between different aspects/demands to fulfill within the design process (C) based on the People, Planet and Profit principle (D)

At each level in the design process different decisions have to be taken. One of those decisions is the application of sustainable energy systems and components. However this is rather complex to integrate in the early stages of building design as many aspects have to be taken into account. During the design process participants and their decisions are structured at several levels of decision-making; the infill-level, the support-level and tissue-level. On each level there has to be made a balance between the performance of supply and demand for the building during the life-cycle, see figure 1C.

During design support, it is important to transfer the essentials of the proposed structures and mechanisms, without overloading other member of the design team with unwanted details. This information control can be achieved by use of abstraction. So far, many building teams have been sending their partners detailed drawings, thus relying on the addressees to make the necessary abstraction themselves. With the increasing use of product information models, it is now possible to incorporate multiple abstraction levels in the design representation. Abstraction is the mapping from one representation of a problem to another, which preserves certain desirable properties and reduces complicity (Giunchiglia et al.1997). Abstraction is the selective examination of certain aspects of a problem. The goal of abstraction is to isolate those aspects that are important for a particular purpose and suppress those aspects that are unimportant (Rumbaugh et al.1991). This enables representations to take an appropriate (abstract) form that matches the needs of the design specialist, thus saving much time and confusion.

Throughout the different levels of abstraction, the description of the building design gradually becomes more and more detailed. The various levels of abstraction should be considered as representations of a particular view on the total information available for a design.

As the design proceeds, more information and detail will be developed. The main part of the project costs are allocated in the early conceptual phase of product development, still in this phase only few resources (manpower, money) are actually spent on the project (Buur & Andreasen 1989). By the dichotomy of this design process at the early stages of design there is little information, even though nearly all the important decisions have to be made at this time, as fig. 2 by den Hartog (2003) shows.




Figure 2 Relation between allocated and actually spent costs during a design project (Buur & Andreasen 1989) and Influence / information contradiction at the early stages of design (den Hartog 2003)

In modern history, design of buildings is seen as largely an individual's creative act: "From Palladio on, architecture has been identified with individual architects." (Habraken 2005, p.28)

This is certainly the case for conceptual design phase, where architect is the one that lays down the vision of the whole building. Moreover, "the belief that a single designer should be in control of all levels of environmental form" (Habraken 2005, p.89) is even seen as a professional ideal. In his book 'Palladio's children', where architectural profession is portrayed as singularly obsessed with perfecting form and crafting it down to the last detail, Habraken (2005, p.111) however points how the proliferation of consultant specialists bring into play de facto co-designers due to the sheer complexity of the contemporary built environment. "Paradoxically, while consultant design may not appear prominently in the completed project, it frequently establishes dimensions, spans, story heights, and other fundamental aspects of architectural character (2005, p.122)." The need for more rational approaches is strongly felt by the architectural profession. The development of rational methods grew into the Design Methodology movement of 1960's (Cross 2001), culminating and effectively ending as far as architecture is concerned with the early work of Christopher Alexander.

In the design of buildings, the process of implementing the clients' but also society's needs and expectations is of great importance. During the last fifteen years attention has enormously increased to comfort in buildings and the consequences for the environment. The design process became more heterogeneous, with several diverse actors involved such as architects, engineers, contractors and clients. In the world of design and engineering, gaps between the different fields can be recognized (Lechner 1991, Cross & Roozenburg 1992, Reymen 2001, van Aken 2003). The different viewpoints imply a need for cooperation: a collaborative approach to the design process. These changes have led to a shift in the role of the architect in the building design process. The former master builder with the responsibility for the totality has been reduced to merely an actor among others in the briefing and design phases of a complex project (Kjølle & Gustafsson 2007). Still architects have a larger influence on the crucial conceptual design decisions during the building design process and often act not as merely an actor but as conductor. Concepts as 'team-work' and 'collaboration' as collective terms for every interaction with other people are needed to deal with the complexity: collaborative design management is needed. Problems emanate from a lack of integration between architectural design and design of indoor climate. Building Services consultants have difficulties adapting their methodical and arithmetical way of working to artistic and intuitive characteristics of architectural design. To a slightly lesser degree, the same applies to structural consultants. This notion of 'professional enmity' is not as insurmountable as it may seem (den Hartog 2003). To make change possible, Dutch government developed a sustainable IFD (Industrial Flexible Dismountable) building program. An IFD-building is seen as an expedient for an optimal useable and efficient building process. The IFD-programme was a joined initiative of the Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment and the Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs. IFD-building is strongly related to 'Open Building', based on the ideas of N.J. Habraken (1961).

3. The road to solution

3.1 Open Building

Open building is primarily intended as an organised way of responding to the demands of diversity, adaptability and user involvement in the built environment. In open building the built environment is approached as a constantly changing product engendered by human action, with the central features of the environment resulting from decisions made at various levels. A central idea in Open Building is to respond to the various needs of individual users through the phasing of the design and implementation process. In order to provide prospective occupants with the opportunity to influence their building, the elements decided by the occupants must be easy to change. Thus adaptability is not merely a means for modifying the dwelling during use; it is first and foremost a strategy for enabling the fulfilment of individual wishes without compromising. Thinking in levels is the basic Open Building principle.

Open building is an attempt to integrate industrial building and user participation in housing, but the concept can also be used for office buildings. It approaches the built environment as a constantly changing product engendered by human activity, with the central features of the environment resulting from decisions made at various levels. The levels which usually are distinguished are the level of city structure, urban tissue, support and infill. Open building entails the idea that the need for change at a lower level such as the dwelling, emerges faster than at upper levels, such as the support. Open building aims at a situation where decisions made on upper levels leave the contents of the decisions to be made at lower levels open.

To meet the challenges of Open building design a methodology has been developed by us. Not only the building to design but also the design process itself became a topic of study. The results of this new approach are called "Duurzaam Flexibele Proces Integratie" – sustainable flexible process innovation. The "thinking in levels" approach of Open building was introduced to improve the design and decision process by structuring them at different levels of abstraction.

The basis of this 'level-thinking' is that of the Open Building (Habraken 1961). As often such new ideas take a long time before being implemented. The Osaka Gas NEXT 21 Project in Shimizudani, Tennoji-ku, Osaka City, Japan, realized in October 1993 is a very nice example of the realisation of the open building approach, see figure 3.



Figure 3 Publication by Habraken, NEXT project interesting realisation of the ideas

2.2 Integral Design Methodology

Christopher Alexander noted back in 1960's that "the intuitive resolution of contemporary design problems simply lies beyond a single individual's integrative grasp" (Alexander 1964). His proposal to tackle this situation was strictly rational and analytic, while still meant for an individual designer. According to Alexander, by defining requirements and interactions of requirements, a systematic decomposition of design task is achieved, which allows for practically automated fitting of different (sub) solutions. Later, Alexander adjusted his approach by using 'semilattice' instead of the linear 'tree structure' (Alexander 1965), eventually developing 'a pattern language' (Alexander et al 1977). His theory was that architectural design is a language consisting of patterns, which are to be used as building stones for designing. This moving away from individual analytical approach opened the path to participatory design, where besides designers the clients and users were to be involved as well.

Although Alexander was not followed by mainstream architects, his work did have big influence on especially architectural education. As one of the founding fathers of the 'design methods movement' (Cross 2007) Alexander's rejection of it – "There is so little in what is called 'design methods' that has anything useful to say about how to design buildings that I never even read the literature anymore... I would say forget it, forget the whole thing..." (Alexander 1971) – is still seen as a 'proof' that intuitive and artistic approaches are to be preferred over methodical and systematic ones. Architectural practice subsequently headed by individual intuitivism "into the analogical fallacy of semiotics; and then post-modernism, deconstruction..." (Nicholson 2002).

Integral design is meant to overcome, during design team cooperation, the difficulties raised in the early conceptual phase of building design. This is achieved by providing methods to communicate the consequences of design steps between the different disciplines on areas such as construction, costs, life cycle and indoor climate at early design stages. The aim is to support all disciplines with information about the tasks and decisions of the other disciplines. Supplying explanation of this information will improve understanding of the combined efforts (den Hartog 2003).

To develop our required model of design support, an existing model from the mechanical engineering domain was extended: Methodical Design by van den Kroonenberg (1978). During early 1970s a prescriptive design model was developed in the Netherlands to teach design to mechanical engineering students at the University of Twente. Called the methodical design model, it was based on the combination of the German (Kesselring, Hansen, Roth, Rodenacker, Pahl and Beitz) and the Anglo-American design schools (Asimov, Matousek, Krick).

This in the Netherlands familiar model was extended into an integral design model by us because; "it is one of the few models that explicitly distinguishes between stages and activities, and the only model that emphasis the recurrent execution of the process on every level of complexity (Blessing 1993, p.1398)". Especially the horizontal dimension is not strongly represented in other familiar design models and thus tend to be forgotten (Roozenburg and Cross 1991, p. 216); "not so much by its authors (see for instance Pahl and Hubka) but by its users and, above all, its critics, leading to faulty arguments and misinterpretations of the model ." A distinctive feature of the integral design model is the four-step pattern of activities that occurs on each level of abstraction with the design process that together forms the Integral Design matrix. The major difference between the integral design matrix and other familiar models is the shaping step, in which the design is 'shaped' in to a lower level of abstraction.

The design activities sequence in integral design is: define/generate, analyze/synthesize, evaluate/select, and implement/shape. If compared with familiar models e.g. the basic design cycle of Roozenburg and Eekels, 1995 (analysis, synthesis, simulation, evaluation and decision) the difference is in the

implementation and shaping of the design into a lower level of abstraction and as such a focus on the connection between the horizontal dimension and the vertical dimension of the design model. The row of the integral design matrix provide the different issues, functions and aspects, to be solved in the design process, based on the process stages distinguished by methodical design (Problem definition, Working principle and Shaping phase) with a new added process stage: the selecting phase. Once completed, the integral design matrix contains a description of the design process for a specific design task. The description is depending on the rationale applied and may not be chronological: the matrix structures the (intermediate) results of the process independently of the sequence in which they were generated (Blessing, 1993, p. 1398). This makes it possible to focus on the selecting phase and to integrate the opinions of others outside the design team more easily. The design process becomes more transparent and this increases the possibility to reach synergy between the different disciplines and/or designers involved in the design process. The focus within the integral design model is on all activities from all design disciplines that are essential to completeness; nothing essential should be lacking.

The methodical design process can be described at the conceptual level as a chain of activities which starts with an abstract problem and which results in a solution. The original methodical design process is extended from three to four main phases, in which eight levels of functional hierarchical abstraction, stages can be distinguished. A feature of our extended model of Methodical design, Integral Design, is the occurrence of a four-step pattern of activities in each stage. In system theory the same activities are proposed for decision processes as can be found for the design process, see figure 4. Within the different phases the main focus is on different steps on a specific abstraction level of the design process. In the matrix stages can be found as well as the four-step pattern of activities. The design process can be looked upon as working one's way through the different levels of abstraction from upper levels to lower levels the design is slowly getting shape. It is possible to connect between the principles of Open building and Integral Design is made see fig. 4.




Figure 4 Comparison between hierarchical levels from the Integral design method and the abstraction levels of Open building and Integral Design

4. Application

In the planning of their own new office Kropman, one of the major Dutch mechanical and electrical contractors, wanted to show their design and engineering capabilities. It had to be innovative and so they decided to design an office building with a flexible construction and notable use of sustainable energy. To make this possible, they developed a sustainable IFD (Industrial Flexible Dismountable) building concept. An IFD-building is seen as a expedient for an optimal useable and efficient building process. The IFD-programme was an joined initiative of the Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment and the Netherlands Ministry of Economoc Affairs. IFD-building is strongly related to 'Open Building', based on the ideas of N.J. Habraken (1998). The application of new innovative construction products and methods in this project demonstrated their potential; and the project reached the status of a demonstration project within the IFD programme of SEV (Stichting Experimentele Volkshuisvesting (Groenedijk etal. 1999). The conceptual design and the final realization are shown in figure 5.




Figure 5 Conceptual design and the final Kropman office

5. Discussion

Isolating design as a discrete discipline during the Renaissance opened the path to innovation (Habraken 2005); throughout history, architecture and building (innovation) had always been systematic, in the sense that ways of building rested on shared elements brought together in fixed and familiar ways. Alexander refers to this as 'timeless way of building'. Nowadays however, within the building as a composition of systems, the architect is neither the designer of all systems, nor does he or she design with all systems. The most important role of architect is to orchestrate and coordinate the team of co-designers, which is assembled ad hoc for each project.

Besides designing the Kropman project, one of the design team members was chairman of the steering committee Climate technology of the TVVL (Dutch Society for Building Services). During this period he was asked questions about the investigation of problems concerning comfort and health in buildings. Instead of treating them with an 'end of pipe solution' approach, where only the effect is treated and not the cause, the real source of the problems was investigated. These problems resulted from mistakes made during the design process, so it was logical to investigate the design process itself. The parallel between the activities within the Kropman design process and the TVVL activities led to a combined effort. The architect and building services consultant of the Kropman project took the initiative to get in touch with the Royal Institute of Dutch Architects (BNA) and Delft University of Technology (TUD). In year 2000, BNA, TVVL and TUD participated in the research project Integral Design. This project primarily aimed at the reduction of failure costs.

Since 2001 we have been propagating 'integral open building design methodology' within Dutch building design practice, through continuously developing learning-by-doing workshops. Integral approach represents "a broad view on the world around us that continuously needs to be adapted and developed from sound and documented experiences that emerge out of interaction between practice, research and education. This integral approach can eventually lead to integral process, team and method – all the required conditions for design of the end product." (Quanjel and Zeiler, 2003) Implicit to this broad view is that integral design solutions are only possible through unification of different viewpoints on the same aspects. This is the reason we assume that a multi-discipline design team view on design is an effective way to pursue building design integration. The aim is to improve conceptual design (process level) by defining an 'integral open building design methodology' that would increase potential for creation of integral building designs (product level). Positive results on these two levels are assumed to eventually trigger and support culture change within (Dutch) building design practice.

6. Conclusion

To support architects more effectively with their tasks, the Integral Design method\ for conceptual design is needed. Transforming a design methodology such as the domain-independent design theory of Open building to a specific multi-disciplinary approach helped to construct a bridge between architecture and building services. The proposed Integral Design method is a possible tool to bridge the gap between design for building to design for a sustainable built environment.

Acknowledgement

TVVL, BNA and TU Delft have supported the Integral Design project. KCBS, Kropman bv and the foundation "Stichting Promotie Installatietechniek (PIT)" support the new research. References

References

- Aken, J.E. van ,2003, On the design of design processes in architecture and engineering: technological rules and the principle of minimal specification, In working paper 03.08, Eindhoven Centre for Innovation Studies, June 2003, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.
- Alexander, C. ,1964, Notes on the Synthesis of Form, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press
- Alexander, C. ,1965, A City is not a Tree, Architectural Forum, Vol 122, No 1, April 1965, pp 58-62 (Part I), Vol.122, No.2, May 1965, pp.58-62 (Part II)
- Alexander, C. ,1971, The state of the art in design methods, DMG Newsletter, Vol.5, nr.3, pp.17-20
- Alexander, C., Ishikawa, S., Silverstein, M., Jacobson, M., Fiksdahl-King. I. and Angel, S., 1977, A Pattern Language, New York, Oxford University Press
- Beitz W., 1985, Systematic Approach to the Design of technical systems and products, VDI 2221 0 Entwüf, VDI, Düsseldorf
- Blessing, L.T.M.,1993, A process-based approach to computer supported engineering design, Proceedings International Conference on Engineering design, ICED'93, the Hague, august 17-19, 1993
- Buur J., Andreasen M.M., 1989, Design models in mechatronic product development, Design Studies, Vol 10 No 3 July
- Cross, N. ,Rozenburg N.,1992, Modelling the Design Process in Engineering and in Architecture. In: Journal of Engineering Design, no. 4/1992, pp. 325-337.
- Cross, N., 2001, Design Discipline Versus Design Science, Design Issues, Vol.17, No.3, pp.49-55
- Cross, N., 2007, Forty years of design research (editorial), Design Studies, Vol.28, No.1, pp.1-4
- Giunchiglia, F., Villafiorita, A., Walsh, T., 1997, Theories of abstraction, A.I. Communications 10 (1997), ISSN 0921-7126.
- Groenedijk, P., Vollaard, P., Vos H., 2000, IFD-bouwen 1999, SEV Rotterdam january 2000, ISBN 90-5239-158.0
- Habraken, N.J., 1961, De dragers en de mensen, Haarlem(dutch)
- Habraken, N.J., 1998, The structures of the ordinary: Form and Control in the Built Environment, MIT Press
- Hartog, J.P.den, 2003, Designing indoor climate, a thesis on the integration of indoor climate analysis in architectural design, thesis manuscript dated 01/09/2003, Delft University
- Hasselt, R.L.A. van, Vaan, R.P. de, Rutten, P.G.S., Trum, H.M.G.J., Prestatiegericht ontwerpen en evalueren, reader bij het college "Geïntegreerd ontwerpen van gebouw en installaties 7S321, november 1998, TU/e
- Kjølle, K.H. Gustafsson, C., 2007, Boundary objects as a translation instrument in design, Proceedings of 4th Nordic Conference on Construction Economics and Organisation Development Processes in Construction Management, 14th–15th June 2007 Luleå, Sweden, rapport 2007:18, Luleå University of Technology Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering.
- Kroonenberg, H.H. van den, 1978, Methodisch Ontwerpen (WB78/OC-5883), University of Twente, (dutch).
- Lechner, N., 1991, Heating, cooling, lighting. Design Methods for Architects, John Wiley & Sons
- Nicholson, R. ,2002, The long march to interdisciplinary design practice, Building Research & Information, Vol 30, No. 5, pp. 385-387
- Pahl G., Beitz, W., Feldhusen, K., Grote K.H., 2007, Engineering Design, A Systematic Approach, Third Edition, Translators and Editors Ken Wallace and Lucienne Blessing, Springer-erlag London Limited 2007
- Reymen, I.M.M.J. ,2001, Improving Design Processes through Structured Reflection, PhD thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology
- Rozenburg, N.F.M., Cross, N.G. (1991) Models of design process: integrating across the disciplines, Design Studies 12 :215-220
- Rozenburg, N.F.M., Eekels, J., 1995, Product Design, Fundamentals and Methods, Wiley, Chichester, UK.
- Rumbaugh, J., et.al., 1991, Object – Oriented Modeling and Design, Prentice – Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- VDI-Richtlinie 2225: Technisch-wirtschaftliches Konstruieren. Düsseldorf: VDI-Verlag 1977

