With the final presentation year of the IBA, the final-use project Universität der Nachbarschaften (UdN) realised by the HCU is coming to an end. Until spring 2014 the existing building of the former social service centre will be demolished. Through personal involvement it has been possible to work as embedded researchers within the setting of the UdN. Based on this personal participation, the inherent potentials can be revealed to transfer the generated resources of the UdN into an alternative scenario for a new development, in order to locally convey the project, embedding knowledge rather than taking it back to the university.
The first scan is based on a triangular research system focusing on the aspects of actors, programmes and physical space. For each aspect the point of view is shifted to inquire the reciprocal relations between these aspects. Through this method it is possible to uncover the high density of diverse activities and programmes which take place at the UdN to reveal its inherent potentials.
To approach the diverse constellations of actors it is important to specify the research and to define different topics of classification. At first it is to say that the interest of this analysis is not dealing with the general network of actors related by the UdN, but focusing on the specific types of users of the building. Therefore this broad scan distinguishes between three different ways of taking advantage of the building. The first group summarises the residents of the UdN with the major clarification of one month of housing to differentiate between permanent and temporary residents. The following group of actors are those who come to work at the UdN. These can be singled out in the sub groups of continuously returning people during a university semester, temporary workers who are characterised by a short but dense time of work at the UdN (workshop) and ephemeral employees who only come for one day to help out in a specific situation (cook). The third group of visitors takes their motivation as distinguishing topic. The first sub group of visitors is interested in the UdN as a general project by the IBA and HCU. Actors who are interested in a specific programme of the UdN are classified as second group. The last sub group of visitors is based on personal networks and strongly relates to the residents as their subjects of interest.
The general activities at the UdN can be classified in three different programmes according to the actor groups. Dwelling as first aspect summarizes the major human needs such as shelter, sanitation and food which all can be accommodated at the UdN in multiple variations. Working as second programme is separated in three groups. Manual labour work is understood as activities of producing physical elements. Furthermore there is the type of information production which describes typically desk work. The last sub group within this programme combines different ways of presentation modalities in the means of knowledge transfer. Finally the UdN generates a variety of leisure activities which are attended by visitors. The UdN hosts entertainment events, temporary gastronomy, culture and education activities and sport possibilities.
The first scan of the spatial classifications reveals that the UdN can generally be distinguished in three different areas according to activities and characteristics which take place. On the one hand, there is the category of individual rooms which are characterised by a mono-functional use. On the other hand, there is the class of collectively utilised areas. These areas are accessible within the building and are used for common as well as individual activities. Furthermore, the garden around the building can be named as third classification as it is publicly accessible and used by passers-by and UdN visitors and residents at the same time.
Out of the previous scan the interest in the superposition of different activities is developed. In this focus the specific focal point lies on the question about how this superposition of activities takes place. With the necessary limitation on three major activities (presentation/meal/retreat) it is possible to dig deeper into the relations of categories of actors, activities and spatial entities.
As the UdN is a university project a recurring activity are the various presentations in a wide range formats. Next to classical presentations such as lectures and exhibitions, the UdN hosts wall presentations or presentation tours about student projects. Another form of presentation which take place are cultural events such as movie screenings, theatre plays or performances. All together it is to say that these presentations are not restricted to a certain part of the building but occur in all collective parts of the building.

The kitchen is the central function in both, spatial and social ways. It is located as a joint between the individual rooms including the sanitation facilities and the common workspaces and therefore is the main meeting place and communication zone. Out of this, the meal becomes a major aspect in the life in the UdN as the activity of using the kitchen includes not only the preparation of a meal, but moreover the consumption of the food which generally happens in a group of residents, or with temporary workers or within the realm of an event with visiting guests.

In contrast to the preceding activities, retreat emphasises on the most individual activity. The activities of retreat are not limited only to sleeping but can appear in other variants. To understand the way of superposition of activities it is important to draw the relation between this individual activity and the other collectively performed activities.
The three UdN programmes of dwelling, working & leisure are split up into sub groups in a delimitation process. Within these sub groups the specific actors can be categorised by similar attributes according to their relation to the UdN. With this method of categorisation it is possible to extrapolate eight basic motivations of coming to the UdN. These abstract motivations are then put back into relation with the sub groups to reveal the major general motives which leads to dependencies and relations between different motivations.

In conclusion of this investigation it is possible to say that the protagonists’ key motivation is socialising & housing and hence the UdN as physical space as it enables all the different activities.
Within this group the actors are all individuals. While for the artist/researcher in residence the programme of the UdN with its focus on neighbourhood research is the crucial motivation. Furthermore this is the only actor who is independent of the collective facilities with a fully equipped studio apartment.

For the other actors the possibility of housing plays a major role for their decision to be part of the UdN. Except for the research fellow, an individual room can not be guaranteed depending on the quantity of temporary residents. These three actor categories are in charge of the function of the UdN and responsible for a variety of tasks ranging from arranging the setting for numerous events, welcoming arriving temporary residents or giving guided tours through the building.

The guest teacher is the only individual actor in this group and therefore occupies a single room. As his interest in the UdN is the starting motivation, the payment of his work as a professional plays a required role. For congress participants the key element of temporary living is the possibility of combining their work and accommodation in the same place and could be more characterised as spatial/functional consumers. In contrast workshop participants live at the UdN according to their participation in a special UdN related programme and therefore are more integrated in the everyday life and hold a certain responsibility for the building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTS</th>
<th>PERMANENT</th>
<th>TEMPORARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>artist / researcher in residence</td>
<td>research fellow</td>
<td>congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international internship / researcher</td>
<td>thesis / project student</td>
<td>int. building workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int. research workshop</td>
<td>guest teacher</td>
<td>int. research workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This group of actors combines the categories of actors which are working at the UdN on a regular and recurrent basis. Within the category of professor / teacher a distinction can be made between supervising an UdN based seminar, critiques, and meetings. Moreover, the two categories of students differ according to their degree of involvement and their relationship to the UdN. In the same manner the IKP seminar actors includes an active participation (production), while the usual seminar participants only use the spatial setting of the UdN.

The group of short term working actors includes those categories which work at the UdN for a short, but continuous period. Construction internship and construction workshop participants usually work a 10 to 6 shift on the site for one to six weeks and are using most of the collective facilities including the containers or the kitchen. The external organisers of a congress concentrate their work at the UdN on few days and are focussing on their individual areas.
The following categories are strongly characterised by an ephemeral appearance, mainly during an event. Nevertheless those categories are recurring throughout the whole term, depending on the different programmes which take place at the UdN. Through this process some of the specific actors have already extended their ephemeral work to a continuous work during one semester (cook / barman).

The first categories of visitors describe those who are interested in the UdN as a project. The major category here are the formally guided tours of visitors to the International Building Exhibition (IBA). Another smaller category is the one of individuals (person/groups) who come across due to the IBA.
Within the group of visitors, the hotel guests are quite similar to temporary residents only that they do not work on site. They use the spatial setting, but also contribute to the communal living by cooking.

Another category are children as participants of workshops / programmes on the one side, but also as neighbours to play in the tree houses. The typical neighbour usually comes to an event, but sometimes the relation to the UdN and its residents become closer that some pass by every now and then in the evening for a drink and a chat. These neighbours are on a similar hierarchy level as friends who come to join events like restaurant.

A special category of actors are the friends of the residents as they passing by every now and then, but also take a certain responsibility as they are participating in activities such as cooking but independent of any programme.
Since the main programmes dwelling, working and leisure consist of a vast number of activities, it was decided to focus on three representative topics: meal, retreat and presentation. The intent is to dismember those clusters of activities into specific actions to reveal recurring patterns. Therefore, the first step is to identify main practices which can be observed in the daily practice at the UdN. One conclusion which can be drawn is that activities related to meals are mostly distinguished by quantity of consumers, i.e. whether it is about cooking for an individual person, for a group, for a restaurant or for an event. These practices can be reduced to an abstract behavioural pattern, valid for everyone. The forms of presentation which take place at the UdN are hardly referable to a general pattern because each form of presenting has particular practices and a specific producer - consumer relations. The most common form of retreat is sleeping over night, whereby the category of actor (permanent or temporary) or the quantity of individuals (person in a single room or a group in a shared room) is not of importance. The crucial element of this activity is the relation between different functional entities, bathroom – toilet – bed.
Presentation cannot be reduced to a general pattern because each form of presenting has certain practices and a specific producer - consumer relation. As the differentiation here is not based on quantity, but on the nature of the presentation, five different patterns can be identified. A general (university) project presentation consists of two actors: the presenter and the audience. This is supported by the material to explain the presentation, which could be prints on the wall, an overhead projector screening or a 1:1 scale model such as the scaffolding. A second educational form of presentation is a meeting between different actors around a certain topic or material to be discussed. An exhibition is characterised by the presented objects and the audience as recipients. Concert is represented by the relation between the performer and the audience, while a screening always needs an additional actant to bring movie on screen.
The first differentiation of activities related to meal is based on quantity, i.e. whether it is about cooking for an individual, for a group or for a restaurant / event. The number and the complexity of practices grow with increasing numbers of actors. Therefore, an individual that cooks and eats alone (usually a resident) performs only basic practices. In the case of a group it changes slightly, as the practice of serving is added. However, the complexity of practices increases more in case of cooking for a very big group, in the case of restaurant or an event. The production part includes also serving and setting up, for the restaurant the food is cooked and for the event it is delivered by a catering service. The consumption aspect becomes also more complex, as additional functions are necessary, such as toilets, wardrobe and reception.
There are various forms of retreat - the simple ones are very casual practices such as having a seat to rest or laying down for a short nap. The actor can be anyone and it can be performed in any public setting. On the other hand, sleeping over night is a more complex form of retreat. The practice of sleeping follows a certain pattern of actions which is the same for both permanent and temporary residents. Moreover the quantity here is also irrelevant - whether it is one actor sleeping in a single room or a group in a shared room - they all perform practices of getting up, dressing, having a shower, etc.
The interest is to identify how different spatial entities can be used and combined to host different activities. After analysing different configurations, it is concluded that the use of space for each activity follows a certain pattern. The main entities for the production of meal are kitchen and storage. Furthermore their physical connection is of high importance. The size of the spaces for the consumption depends on the number of actors. Areas for retreat are determined by closable rooms for individual persons or an alcove in case of sleeping in a shared room. In both cases the important relations are the connections to the sanitation facilities. On the other hand spatial entities and combinations that enable presentation are diverse and defined by the format of the presentation which depend on its content, quantity of audience or the configuration of elements within the spatial entity in use.

The main difference between the practices according to their facility independent activities is that meal and presentation in general take place in the collective spaces, whereas those of retreat are mostly in individual spaces.
The areas for presentation vary in their combination and size according to the type of presentation. The only constant aspect is that it always takes place in the collective zones. A choice of a space for a lecture depends on the quantity of the audience - working rooms for smaller groups and the event space for bigger ones.

Student works are be presented on walls or tables, hence the irrelevance of choice of spatial entities. On the other hand the configuration of elements (walls, tables) within the spatial entity gains in importance. The production of screening requires only a wall, but the choice of space depends on the size of the audience. Performance requires a slightly bigger space but moreover chose their location by the quality of the spatial entity.

The configuration of spatial entities used for exhibitions depends on the size and quality of the exhibits, but also on the artists’ concept (exhibiting in the toilet, for instance). The most irregular form of presenting is a guided tour, where the size and number of spatial entities in use does not depend on the number of people, but on the content of the tour.
The first differentiation referring to the spatial entities depend on the number of actors involved in production and consumption. Individual producer and consumer are only the residents. The main functions for the meal production are kitchen and storage which is partly individual space as it contains private elements. Each actor requires minimal space for eating and hence the variety of choices of spaces which could even be an individual room. However, a special case is that of the artist/researcher in residence, the only actor who is independent of the collective facilities as he/she has the possibility of cooking and eating in the studio apartment. Groups usually consist of only residents, residents and their friends or of student (seminar) participants. The production also takes place in the kitchen and depends on storage whereas the space used for the consumption depends on the size of the group and the atmosphere of the location. A smaller group for example usually eats in the foyer, as it gives a sensation of closeness. The third type of configurations refers to the artist/researcher in residence.

The production, on the other hand, is done by a small number of people, usually a cook and some assistance. As a consequence, the necessary spatial entities are kitchen and storage, or only kitchen in case of a catering service providing food. The size and the combination of spatial entities for food consumption depend on the choice of actors setting the restaurant or event, or on the number of expected guests. Furthermore, the foyer is the place of exchange between production and consumption or the zone where the food is offered. Moreover, other spatial entities that are not directly related to cooking or eating are also important in this case - toilets and the entrance with the reception.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAL</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL</th>
<th>RESTAURANT / EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Production
- Consumption
- Relation
- Exchange

The diagrams illustrate the different configurations and spatial entities involved in meal production and consumption.
The spaces for retreat are distinguished by the number of actors. Individual actors are mostly permanent residents and therefore sleep in individual rooms. The relation to the spatial elements toilet and shower is of high importance for the practice of sleeping. The sanitation facilities are shared, except the studio apartment of the artist/researcher in residence. As an individual room cannot be guaranteed depending on the quantity of temporary residents, some permanent residents periodically sleep in shared rooms. However, the majority of groups sleeping at the UdN are temporary residents. The number and the size of spatial entities used as shared sleeping rooms differ according to the number of the group members. An exception are hotel guests who sleep in the outside located capsules. In this case, each person has a minimal individual space. The connection to sanitary facilities is improved by open air sanitation facilities on the rooftop.
Deepening the focus on the superposition of activities, the preceding research gives hint to the importance of the process of creating different overlapping spaces. Therefore the next detailed zoom concentrates on four different situations to unfold the relations between specific actors and spatial entities, to unveil the practice of placing elements and to analyse the arrangements of elements. This complex trinomial research of Tree Houses 2012, Hotel? Wilhelmsburg, Low Budget Urbanity Congress and Café UdN is necessary to extract conditions out of these spatial configurations.

In order to enable a superposition of various activities, certain spatial characteristics must be provided. Since it is not possible within the limited amount of time to analyse all different programmes within the UdN, four specific situations are picked which satisfy two crucial criteria:
1. The situation must include a superposition of diverse activities, involving diverse actors that use different areas within the UdN.
2. A participation directly in or at least being present at the UdN during that explicit duration must be guaranteed that personal experiences or participatory observation, action research and a direct access to internal material can be ensured.
During two weeks in the summer holidays 2012, 20 local children and 25 students were building different tree houses on the perimeter of the UdN as well as in the park. In a participatory process with the children different construction techniques were developed out of recycled materials during this workshop. While the workshop for the students already started at 10 o’clock, the children were coming after lunch and stayed till 7 pm. In general different building teams work individually on their own tree house but the work was still dotted with collective games, an afternoon snack and as highlight a common dinner at the end of the day. Due to this variety of different programmatic aspects, the students worked in different fields such as cooking, organisation, material acquisition, profiling and building. As the tree house building camp was the only public programme next to some permanent residents, the UdN offered enough space for all the different activities to take place at the same time.

The Low-Budget Urbanity Congress took place at the UdN in March 2013, bringing together a group of international Ph.D. candidates researching on the economics and politics of saving practices. They temporarily dwelled and worked in the building, performing all their daily activities. At the time this new programme was introduced, there were several other programmes taking place at the UdN: residents who were permanently dwelling and working, construction site trainees doing their four weeks long internship and HCU students having weekly seminars. This situation outlines several conflicts evolving through the superposition of an external programme whose realisation needs exceptional requirements. An illustration is a compulsion to produce noise (construction site trainees) in contrast to the necessity of a calm working atmosphere which is required by participants of Low Budget Urbanity Congress.
The Restaurant that is one of the important functions of the Hotel project and it enabled opening up to the neighbourhood, making the students’ work visible by inviting the neighbours both to participate as cooks, musicians or bartenders and to join as guests. Each Wednesday of the winter semester 2012-2013 the organisation group involved new actors for the production part of the event, and as a consequence they brought new guests along and the network of contacts was constantly growing. Moreover, new spatial settings were tested and new findings about the functioning of a restaurant were reached. The interesting aspect of this programme is the connection between different spatial settings and the appropriation of space by different actors.

The UdN Café is a students’ initiative to try another way of opening up to the neighbourhood by setting up a café on the newly built terrace facing the park. It has similarities to the restaurant project, as it also requires organisation of production and arranging spatial elements. However, it takes place on a smaller scale and with fewer actors involved, hence it provides an opportunity to study more closely how different spatial configurations influence people’s interaction. Moreover, with its location on the park side where numerous neighbours spend their Sunday afternoons, it offers an experimental setting to test different ways of invitation and engagement, recalling the theme of diverging examples of individual perception of private and public space.
The intent is to inquire how situation-specific actors use spatial entities in order to identify the spatial relations they create between those. Varying from different situations, abstract diagrams are used to illustrate the intensity of space use by different actors at a specific time or over time. Hence, diverse topics are developed for specific situations and specific conclusions are drawn, recalling different forms of superposition of activities. One of the most interesting aspects is the conflicts that arise in the use of space when individual and collective uses overlap. Mapping the spatial use by different actors reveals specific patterns in every single situation. The conflicts in spatial utilisation within the Low-budget Urbanity Congress are distinctive as the activities taking place have opposite requirements. The question that arises regards the relation between individual and collective activities illustrating under what conditions they can coexist in connected spatial entities. In the Tree Houses situation there were hardly any conflicts regarding space use.
as all the actors adhered to the same programme, hence had the same requirements, and the good weather furthermore allowed them to work outside. The accent here is more on appropriation of spaces in series, as spatial requirements were changing during the performance of the programme and some activities had to be expanded in additional spatial entities. The spatial relations in the Restaurant situation illustrate how intensity of use of a space can be altered by its different configurations and by introducing or removing functions. Moreover, these variables also define relations between different spaces. The spatial relations in the UdN Café follow a similar logic. The intensity of use of the consumer area is delineated by different spatial configurations, but it is also very dependent on its relations to other spaces and their activities. For instance, the more activities take place in the park, the greater the probability of interaction with the adjacent terrace and hence a greater intensity of its activities.
The first series shows the utilisation of the UdN over the course of a day. During the morning, only the students were present starting with a group meeting, before they began work in individual building teams. While the majority of students went out for lunch, the remaining were cooking together and having lunch at the UdN. In the continuity of the workshop some children were coming earlier but had to be sent out to the park for reasons of liability.

Within the construction camp, the kids worked at the different building sites but were joining collective games at various locations in the park and an afternoon snack at different locations. In the afternoon, a cooking team was preparing the collective dinner for the evening and therefore had to block the kitchen from passerby. The daily dinner usually took place in the event space or in the park.

On the last day, a big event with the parents and neighbours took place where the children presented their tree houses. Furthermore the garden, the terrace and park were used as a stage and for holding a barbeque.

The second series reveals the spatial relation for the specific actor groups. Besides children, five different tree house teams and a group of organisers were involved. The tree house teams had specific construction sites but were using parts of the building as workshops and for developing tree house profiles. Furthermore, students of each team had to supervise the tree house related children and were involved in the collective games. The children were working in their chosen tree house team but joined the collective activities in the building and the park. Furthermore the organisers were in charge of supervising the building teams as well as organising material, arranging...
the collective activities and preparing the dinner and therefore used the whole building, in particular the office and the spaces in which several activities or groups were situated. Besides smaller conflicts which arose out of the behaviour of the children (temporary barriers because of safety reasons), the variety of different dimensions and locations made it easy for all groups to work simultaneously. As a workshop of a building team grew bigger, it was possible for other groups to move to another location. However, the sunny weather allowed several workshops to be shifted to an outside location. Furthermore, the individual groups where all part of the same programme and therefore had similar requirements.
The main focus in this situation is on illustrating the difference in spatial relations for specific actor groups before and after the introduction of the new actor group. The Low Budget Urbanity Congress participants - a group of 20 young researchers stayed at the UdN for five days. They used the building for all their activities during the congress. They were sleeping in shared rooms and using the sanitation facilities in the more private wing of the building. They had breakfast in the kitchen and foyer, whereas dinner and lunch were prepared for them by a cook or brought by a catering service. They dined in the event space, which they also used for lectures and presentations for the entire group. The working rooms, on the other hand, were used for working in smaller groups, wall presentations and table discussions.

The change in residents’ spatial relations regards minor usage of storage and kitchen, where food is prepared for the congress three times a day. In addition, they completely stopped using the working rooms, as those were occupied by the congress and thus they worked in their individual rooms.

The HCU students usually had seminars in the working rooms and the event space, but during the congress they worked at the university and did not use the building at all. The construction site trainees used to eat, work on computers, change and store their personal belongings in the event room. Now all those activities had to be transferred to the loft, as the congress took place in the event space. In addition, they had less access to the kitchen and the storage. However, the biggest change in their activities regarded the working space, as they initially worked both on ter-
race and scaffolding, but now had to stop their activities on the terrace because of its proximity to the event space. In the second representation spatial relations are not shown for specific actor, but in general, as the focus shifts from actor to intensity of space use. However, once again the distinction was made between the space use before and after. The outcome shows that the intensity of use of event space, working rooms, the loft and the sleeping rooms increased, while the terrace was not used at all anymore. Furthermore, the spaces with increased activities all happen to be used by an individual actor group. In contrast with those are the collectively used spaces (foyer, kitchen, toilets). Interestingly here is the identification of conflict zones between those two types of spaces and their spatial configuration. In this situation, the attempt was made to separate conflicted space uses by using dividing elements, such as drawing a curtain for visual and acoustic separation (between event space and the foyer) or placing some activities on different heights (e.g., individually used loft is separated from the collective space by a ramp of stairs). In conclusion, these elements can be used to reduce the clash between diverse space thanks to their attributes (e.g., opaque/ removable/soft or static/high/hard).
The focus of this situation is to identify the variations of space use and its intensity by diverse actors during different restaurant editions. It is in a way more simple than the other situations due to the fact that there are always the same spaces and the same actors in question for each edition. The variable part includes configuration of the spaces and location of main functions (bar, food serving, etc.). Organisation group includes students who are taking care of spatial setting and organisation, helping to cook and hosting the event. Therefore, they use the whole publicly accessible part of the building, in particular the customer orientated spaces (foyer, event space and the working rooms) as they prepare them, as well as the food production spaces (kitchen and storage).

The cook exclusively uses the food production area which includes kitchen and storage, with one exception: the event with buffet in the event space when the cook was serving food and thus using an additional room. Musician can be a single person or a band. They come to the event with motivation to perform, and since the stage was always in the event space, their space usage was mostly related to this room. Guest is the consumer of this event; therefore their use of the spaces depends on where the main functions are placed. For example, during dinner #1, bar, reception and food serving were set in the foyer. Thus guest activities were mostly concentrated in this room. However, they ate and listened to music in the events space. During dinner #7 on the other hand, the majority of functions were concentrated in the events space: bar music, buffet, tables for eating. This resulted in a vast use of this space, where myriad ac-
Activities overlapped at the same time. In addition, there was an exhibition in the working spaces, hence the increase in their usage.

Resident is the only one who during the event of restaurant uses also parts of the house that are neither consumer nor producer areas, such as individual rooms. They however, also participate at the event as guests and thus adhere to the usual space use patterns.

The conclusion is that these spatial variations can be strategies to concentrate people in one space by placing most of the functions there or on the other hand, to disperse functions, encouraging people in that way to use different spaces with less intensity. These strategies can be altered depending on the number of visitors or on the concept of the restaurant edition in question.
The series analyses spatial relations for each edition of Sunday’s Café. The quantity of utilised spaces is limited to production area (kitchen and storage), consumer area (usually terrace) and additional service spaces (entrance, toilets, etc.) with slight differences for each event edition.

In the vertical order actor categories can be traced. The constant actors are the organisation team, differentiated in two actor categories, depending on whether they only work or also dwell at the UdN. Worker prepares food and coffee and serves the customers, while resident and worker also use the private wing of the building (sleeping, sanitation).

Other actors represented in the schemes are mostly consumers, usually one-time visitors hence there is a different actor for each café edition. They include guest neighbour, HCU exhibition visitors (exhibition took place in the working rooms), IBA tour (visiting the building and the scaffolding), studio guest (professor who came for a building workshop) and friends of workers and residents.

Next, for each café edition different observations were made. In the first café the consumer area together with the counter was moved to the park as to enhance the accessibility. The second café on the other hand has a more introverted character, as no external guests were present. Moreover, due to changing weather less people used the park; hence the interaction between consumer area and public space was minimal. In the event of the third café it was raining, so the consumer area was moved to the foyer and the fixed counter between foyer and kitchen was mediator between production and consumption. However, there was an exhibition taking place in the working rooms hence some of its visitors joined as café guests.
The modifications introduced to the fourth café include an additional production element - the waffle station behind the counter, a part of terrace used for computer work, and extension of the consumer area to the lower part of the terrace. All this contributed to a very intensive use of the terrace. The fifth café kept the consumer area extension and had a good interaction with the park. Moreover, one of the guests was a professor that had just moved into the studio and he also received a guided tour of the project. Hence, besides terrace, he used the studio for retreat and visited the scaffolding as well as the rest of the building. In conclusion, this set up illustrates how the intensity of the space use of the consumer area increases with the increase of the interactions and relations to other spaces used by a myriad of actors (park, working spaces, scaffolding, etc.).
Within the open setting of the UdN it is up to the actor to become active to create a spatial configuration which serves his requirements. These actions are strongly linked to the specific actor and the programmatic framework and relate directly to the configuration of elements. This catalogue does not limit to the four different situations, but furthermore documents some observations which had been made throughout the entire participation time at the UdN.

The programme café at the UdN reflects the basic ideas of a café prototype. A counter is the basic spatial element within a prototype of a café, the counter is used to display the offers (self-made cake, coffee, water...) as its physical structure is the dominating single object on the terrace. This aspect of spatial domination is used by the café initiators to overlay the ordinary “private kitchen extension / private living room” setting by a new public accessible café setting.

To underline this new setting, typical decorative elements such as white table cloth, flowers, fancy tableware are used to create a café relating atmosphere. This combination of food display and decorative arrangements on a space dominating object is the key element which enables the use of the terrace as a public café. But to attract the guests, this offer has to be presented that the local park visitors take notice and are invited to start the interaction with the café. Therefore, the counter needs to be placed on a highly visible location to attract attention.
Due to the implementation of the café, a new student moved into the UdN, into the room shared by two students. To mark an individual "private" zone within the big room, the student used a carpet as key element which was furthermore accumulated with the spacing of smaller elements. The carpet gives the implication of "living room" with its soft materiality it is seen as warm and cozy and therefore associated with „home“. Its limits mark clearly the threshold to enter the private zone in which the bed is standing.

In additional to the carpet, the arrangement of specific objects (sled) is a manner of appropriation which underlines its individuality. The displayed personal belongings give a hint to a specific actor who moved in and communicates in a way the permanence of dwelling in the ambivalent setting of the UdN.

Supplementary to the used objects/materials with their obvious connotation (carpet = home), this practice of arranging elements strengthen the perceived level of privacy as the objects refer to one individual person and show, that this person reflected on this specific arrangement.
BAR AS SPATIAL PARTITION
dividing element between the outdoor living room and the working space

WOODEN TABLE AS SPATIAL PARTITION
dividing element between the café consumers’ area and the working space

CURTAIN AS SPATIAL PARTITION
although soft and removable, curtain provides visual barrier

CORRIDOR AS PRESENTATION ROOM
presentation of student work on the wall

TENNIS TABLE AS WORK SPACE
the extensive surface allows desk work when nobody is playing table tennis

WINDOW AS WORK CHART
using removable window as temporary working surface
COUNTER AS INVITING ELEMENT
placing the counter next to the foot path
to show public offer

STEP AS INVITING ELEMENT
addition of a step to facilitate access

CAFÉ ATMOSPHERE
white table cloth and decorations create
café atmosphere in the park

LIVING ROOM ATMOSPHERE
transforming loft into a living room by
placing carpet and mattresses

LAVATORY AS STORAGE SPACE
besides laundry this room is used for
storing tools, equipment, etc.

CORRIDOR AS STORAGE SPACE
appropriation of access space
The intent is to inquire how the spatial entities are reconfigured by different arrangements of non-human-elements or goods. By studying the four situations different answers to this question have come to light. One of the emerged topics is the superposition of activities at the same space, but at different times. The examples displayed in the situations of Low-Budget Urbanity and Tree Houses 2012 show how spaces can be completely transformed by different choices of elements and their different rearrangement. Hence, a same room can be transformed from restaurant into a conference room, from working room into a sleeping room, etc. While in the first two cases it is more about configuration of space, the two later situations have their focus on single place-making elements, such as bar or counter, that by their size and position define the character of restaurant or cafe. Moreover, observation of different editions of these two programmes unveils how placing elements in different ways (arrangement of tables and chairs) can create different atmospheres and cause different reactions of visitors.
The main activities during the event of Tree Houses 2012 were building prototypes, building models and material testing. To enable these to take place, different spatial configurations had to be arranged.

The first theme that emerges is the superposition of activities at the same space but at different times which implies changes in the use of space and hence different arrangements of spatial elements. Thus, the loft was used for production (the central area was cleared to make space for knitting fire hoses), material testing (the pillars were used as support for testing the resistance of foil for the Cocoon tree house) and afternoon snack (several tables for placing food and drinks, cushions and carpet for sitting). By the same token, working spaces hosted production (knitting the Nest tree house), model building (configuring tables and chairs to facilitate the manual work) and storage (stash-
The second theme deals with spatial requirements that enable expansion of an activity. An illustration is provided with knitting the Nest tree house. Its production started in only one working space, but then had to be extended to adjoining spaces due to its size and the number of people involved in its production. Hence, there was a sequence of space appropriation, requiring a change of use of each appropriated room.
As foreshadowed when showing relations between specific actors and spatial entities, this situation displays a major divergence between the space use before and after arrival of the congress participants. In order to change its use, a space has to be reconfigured by the aid of spatial elements.

The first focus is on transformation of the event space. It was previously used by construction site trainees for various activities; several tables were grouped for collective eating, individual tables used for computer work, chairs for changing construction shoes, corners of the room for storing personal belongings. A change for the congress content was enabled by putting even more tables together in the central part of the room and using a wall for projecting presentations.

Another theme is enabling group work of different sizes by the aid of elements’ reconfiguration, illustrated by the comparison between the event space and the working spaces. Besides intrinsic characteristics of these spatial entities that make them more suitable for bigger or smaller groups respectively, the configurations of elements within them also diverge. That is, while the event space has all tables grouped, the chairs and tables in the working spaces are distributed in a manner of forming small niches. Moreover, a big wall surface in the event room is used for screening, while the parts of walls in the working rooms served as support for wall presentations.

The third focus is on how activities can move from a bigger space into a smaller one by an appropriate configuration of elements. An illustration is relocation of activities performed by the construction site trainees from the event space into the loft. Finding corresponding practices within different activities can enable them to use the same elements. For example, trainees were using the same tables and chairs for eating and computer work, the nest was used both for changing and resting, etc.
Each restaurant edition always uses the same spaces but configured in a different way by the virtue of arranging spatial elements. It is to say that the production area does not change its configuration. The counter is generally used as an exchange zone between the production and consumption, i.e. for serving food. This intensifies the interaction between the guests and the kitchen area which is part of the strategy to bring them closer to the process and give opportunity to get in contact with each other. However, it is the consumer area that is most prone to changes and reconfigurations, as the interest is to test different solutions and consequential spatial appropriation by the guests. Hence diverse arrangements are applied and some lessons are learned by the principle of trial and error. For example, the bar was initially in the foyer that was crowded in contrast to the event space that would consequently result in being deserted. Therefore, since the third dinner the function of bar was moved to the event space where it still continued to change location and physical form, ranging from a table, different assemblages of wooden planks, to a scaffolding construction. The reception was also open to changes, after testing several locations, it was finally set at the entrance next to the stairs, allowing enough space for a queue. Working spaces also changed their use throughout the dinner editions - from dining room, playing room (dart board) to an exposition space. Moreover a mixture between lounge and eating tables was experimented with here as well, enabling superposition of more activities in the same room.

The elements offering greatest possibility of rearrangements are tables and chairs.
Several distribution schemes were experimented with: single, clustered, straight ones, crosswise, etc. However, an observation was made that when they have no strict distribution the place becomes more relaxed. The buffet system offered the opportunity of having a more open structured furniture concept. It promotes greater circulation, occupation and use of different rooms and hence more interaction between people.
The café was an opportunity to test in 1:1 scale how different spatial arrangements condition the use of space. Given the small scale of the event, it was possible to make interventions in location by improvisation and interaction with the visitors. The elements that are easiest to rearrange are tables and chairs. Here different distribution systems are tried out, with the conclusion that single tables with two to four chairs give the most successful image of a café. Moreover, the decisive factor is not merely configuration of those elements, but also their attributes. For instance, there is a noteworthy difference between a plastic chair, wooden chair and a metal garden chair. Furthermore, small tables are more suitable for a café than big ones, and a white table cloth contributes to the café atmosphere.

Main place-making element is the counter, as it represents a mediator between production and the guests, hence a first contact point. It has always had the same appearance, but has been placed in different ways on the terrace to test accessibility levels. Furthermore, in the first café it was placed in the park enabling the consumer area to concur to the public space. However, in the event of third café, the fixed kitchen counter was used as an exchange point. The advantages of the external counter are its visibility and distinctiveness as a single element, the attributes of being mobile and self-made. Another accessibility strategy was building a step for the fourth café to traverse physical and mental barrier between terrace and the park. Moreover the consumer area was expanded to the lower part of the terrace, making it closer and more open for the park users. While all of the above mentioned configurations were done with the aim of making the private more open to the public, there are others that do the opposite. For
instance, the waffle station which is an element of production was attached to the counter because of convenience of serving food, but still hidden behind it, in a private zone. Furthermore, in the event of the fourth café there was a group of students working on their computers on the terrace. They were participating in the café organisation, but also wanted some privacy for working. Hence, they set their working space in the southern side of terrace, using removable windows and a table as elements that divide their more individual working space from a collectively used consumer area of the café.
CONCLUSIONS

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The major enabling factor for the programme of the University of Neighbourhoods is the legal and financial framework which forms the backbone of this diverse project. Even though the UdN is a low-budget project, without the financial support of the key actors (HCU, IBA, City of Hamburg) the building could not be run in this way. Furthermore, the initiators and supervisors are determining the openness of the project by implementing a variety of programmes as well as allowing and enhancing additional “unplanned” programmes to develop out of the situation.

ROOM & LOCATION

The analysis of different programmes and their relations within the building clearly show, that certain spatial specifications have a great impact on the implementation of a function. The size and location of a room within the building define its relation to the building (and the other rooms) itself and moreover its relation to the surrounding. Therefore, these two characteristics outline the key points which determine specific uses to take place.
As the example of the UdN shows, a building does not always possess all spatial requirements and therefore needs to undergo certain physical alterations to enable different functions. As the future programme cannot always be determined for a long-term period, the physical structure of a building needs to be open enough to follow the performance of the programme.
As spaces always depend on the individual perception of a person, the same spatial configuration can be "read" in different ways which leads to misunderstandings, especially if spaces cannot be distinguished. Within the UdN for example, the residents include the open space (with table) to the "kitchen", while seminar participants refer to this space as "foyer".

It is quite easy to understand that a bigger physical space logically allows a higher variety (quantity) of activities to take place. Nonetheless, the relation between the size of a room, the activity taking place and the number of actors involved define the quality, the atmosphere of the activity. Furthermore, a series of smaller spatial units allow the connection to a sequence of spaces which can still host the majority of programmes.
The detailed research of four specific situations which took / are taking place at the UdN demonstrate that flexible structures and objects are the base of the multifunctionality of the permanent structure. By the various re-configurations and re-positionings of spatial elements such as counter, chairs, tables, curtains, carpet and so on, spatial units can be divided into smaller individual entities or joined together to a system of spatial units.
The studies of the UdN reveal that there are four different types of superposition of activities. The first superimposition is regarding the history of the programme of the building which changed from its primary use as home for unmarried women (boarding house) to a district health centre and used to be abandoned (illegal drug use inside the house) for 15 years before it was turned into the University of Neighbourhoods.

Furthermore the following types refer to the current situation. The superposition of activities and can be distinguished between three different peculiarities.

- at different times in the same room
- at the same time in different rooms
- at the same time in the same room

Whilst the first is a quite ordinary action and can be found very often, the second and third type are generating more conflict lines as they are taking place simultaneously. Especially the superposition of activities in one space at the same time needs more negotiation between the different actors and activities than the others.
The quantity is a crucial factor for various combination possibilities. First of all, there are three different categories of quantity. The first one describes the number of people who are taking part in an activity or in using a room. The next type refers to the quantity of activities which are taking place. Finally the size of the physical space as an important quantity is to mention. (Note: The quantity of actors can refer to the number of people but an actor can also be defined as an institution or local authority. The quantity of activities does not refer to single practices, but to activities they constitute.)