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Introduction

Observation of the world is applied through the lenses of personal experience, as a student of Architecture, I combined my love of understanding the built environment with my passion for Street Photography to create an observation of design intervention and trends in motion. I am also growing up in a generation defined by methods of connection and media which create new social norms or trends at a rate to alarming to be understood fully. Through observation and understanding of changing conditions of both the social and urban environment, I began to wonder how the city and living environment might respond to a new ever-changing society paced at a rate which architecture cannot keep up. This started to shape my approach to my thesis in how our cities are to respond to a society who is defined by constant change and how our architecture is to respond to today, and our future’s everchanging conditions.
As time goes on, people define the values of society and culture through changes that occur from events of politics, war, and technology. Today we are experiencing a shift in society as social values change due to technology and new industries, placing a mark on history, a generation who’s perception of social interaction and concept of living has changed. My project seeks to investigate how a new set of values are to affect the model of living in an urban environment as more people begin to move into cities with new values and social expectations. This presents an opportunity to develop a new living prototype which addresses the upcoming millennial values of; constant connection, diversity, freedom of choice, convenience, time, and patience through focuses on the offering of the living unit, building program, cost, and social interaction and prefabrication in a new building typology.

I hope to create a new building prototype which seeks to materialize what the future direction of society’s living expectations might become. My thesis is ultimately a critique of the new values held by a society ruled by new digital age and how they challenge traditional notions of both living and the urban environment dictated by architecture. This critique of society’s values aims to push towards the future of our cities living environment potential and a point of reflection for our future cities and lives.
Issue

After the year 2000 great changes began to happen with the common use of the internet and slowly it made its way into mainstream use by most members of society in the United States and abroad. Social Media and other forms of connection allow people to communicate freely without the limitations of physical space, this break from physical interaction have also shaped our interactions in society. Overall our values as a society have been shaped by the generation of Millennials and Gen Z’ers who hold a different set of expectations for the world and more important architecture. The way we interact with each other is directly tied to the way in which we exist in our living environment and architecture. So if our interaction’s over the last 20 years have changed from mostly physical interaction to a much more even split between online and physical, what does this mean for our values as a society and our values towards our architectural living environment and cities?

Importance

Most major markers in history are reflected by a change in architecture theory, presenting projections into what the possibility of the future might be, later to be materialized in new architectural styles. Over the last 500 years, the rate at which new architectural styles find their footing has increased as the world has continued to change, highlighting the important factor to this thesis, change and how it is dealt with in a society that only seems to change. If change is so prevalent and if values are shifting to a more adaptable and immediate society, our architecture should be able to respond to the new conditions of set forth by those who wish to occupy spaces which can adapt to changing conditions and needs of society at the scale of a city.
Thesis Intent

My thesis aims to investigate the changing conditions occurring in society today and how our architecture has the potential to respond to new everchanging conditions of social interaction and programmatic needs in a city environment of the future. My aim is to understand the nuances between society and architecture as a reflection of each other’s characteristics, and also to critique what changes are happening in both areas as we experience architectural and societal changes at a more frequent basis.

The Metamorphic Model is a look into future Millennial Urban living through an experiment to create a building prototype per the needs and wants for future architecture. It focuses on creating a building infrastructure which creates social environments for the residents and the community alike through a modular system of units supported by building infrastructure which lifts and moves the units into the desired slot. The goal is to oppose to typical buildings format which takes time to modify and adapt to changing conditions and highlight the trends moving into the future. The idea of the project is to take the changing values of newer generations and the larger collective of society and create a test for how we might live in the next 10, 25, or 50 years. The building is composed of a steel outer structure which supports both the units themselves and the mechanism which lifts and moves them into place. The entire structure and environment are meant to be adaptable and change depending on the conditions which are needed by the residents and by the building itself. The focus is to show what a potential “metabolist” building of the future can do to adapt to the changing conditions of a more fast-paced life, this has occurred in many different industries and life in general. The Metabolist Model is ultimately an idea of what a potential modular living model will be in the future in the context of our current generation defined by new concepts, values, and technologies who ultimately are looking for a living environment which supports the change and values of the future.
My aims for research on social changes is to understand what the Millennial generation has begun to change in society and how future generations such as Generation Z, now entering the workforce, will take the reigns and continue to further the changes set for by a generation liberated to the constant connection and integration of the internet and more into society. I wanted to isolate what factors of these generations are shifting in the workplace, in personal interactions, and the environments which they inhabit.

Generation X: Born between 1965 -1979, roughly 82 million Americans.
Generation Z: Born between 1995-2015, nearly 74 million Americans (Kasasa, web)

Breaking down the behaviors and demographics of Gen Y and Z involved mostly Y.1 and Gen Z because members of gen Y.2 are more likely to be moving out into the suburbs and starting families, the focus is those moving out of suburban areas to become college educated and or move into denser city environments.

Richard Sweeney from the New Jersey Institute of Technology published a study in 2006 titled “Millennial Behavior & Demographics” where he begins to lay out the main differences and similarities between Gen X and Gen Y. Overall Gen Y is more selective and worried about customization, prefer learning by doing rather than lectures, value time greatly and take advantage of flexible options and convenience, are quite impatient with no tolerance for delays, are practical and result oriented in the workplace, value multitasking, are digital natives, are highly collaborative, focus on a balanced life between work and social life, and find a sense of entitlement. Further breaking down these characteristics, Millennials can be described as: Warm, Reasonable, Emotionally Stable, Rule-Consciousness, Socially Bold, Sensitive, Apprehensive, Open to change, Perfectionist, Self-reliant (Sweeney, pg. 6).
On a large scale, the Millennial values mobility, convenience, and options for transportation, which is why many are moving from urban centers for better changes of employment and enjoyment during and after the process of a college education (Skeleton, pg. 469). A large number of the Millennial generation moving into denser cities are college educated or beginning their studies in the city, this is the demographic currently, Gen Y.1 and Y.2, which are setting trends for cities such as using Uber or Lyft. Generation Y.2 is beginning to move back into suburban areas seeking more space for the potential to start a family but depending on their area and city of study.

Millennials value the cultural diversity that cities foster from culture to the landscape which is offered. There is an ingrained relationship between the city, transportation, and culture which defines urban mobility, relationality, and social identity in cities (Skeleton, pg. 468). There is also growing concern for their movement of Millennials and other into cities which are driving forces of Gentrification and historical areas of cities, these growing concerns have to lead to an emphasized important to the social sustainability of cities and their population (Skeleton pg. 470). The two main dimensions of social sustainability are equitable access and the sustainability of the community, which are growing concerns for members of Gen Y and Z looking to grow up in the cities post graduation (Dempsy, Bramley, Power, Brown, pg. 1).

Overall, there is a certain level of dissatisfaction and frustration with the current system of living in higher density cities as economic, urban, social, and architecture considerations are driving a sustainable movement both for their environment but the larger community of the city. Outlined by these studies, it is important to consider the urban capital of a city and its members and how these generations of people interact at a level which is sustainable on all levels to all groups of people, not just the college educated who wish to move into cities.
Articles

“They are a huge generation of impatient, experiential learners, digital natives, multitaskers, and gamers who love the flat, networked world and expected nomadic connectivity 24/7... they are demanding consumers who expect more selectivity, personalization, and customization in their products and services." (Sweeney, pg. 1). “Millennials prefer to keep their time commitments flexible longer in order to take advantage of better options... they opt for the convenience and flexibility... have no tolerance for delays... they expect their services instantly when they are ready.” (Sweeney, pg. 3).

Millennials are a different generation from the rest in terms of their standards and expectations of society, and in this regard have begun to shape how our society works on a new platform of customization, flexibility, and immediacy. Call it innovation or destruction of what used to exist, the world is beginning to change at a pace which is difficult to keep up with. Taking these trends of the Millennial gen y & Z, how could these values and trends create the building of the future for a generation looking to live in an urban setting?

What does flexibility, customizable, and immediate building look like and what does it mean for the industry of living urban and for the industry of architecture?
Overall populations worldwide and within the United States are moving into more urban areas. At the end of World War II with assistance from the Interstate Highway Act and the G.I. Bill lead to a massive exodus into the suburbs and an overall growth of suburban life. Since then trends have leveled out due to economic and infrastructural restrictions, but many are choosing to both stay in cities despite rising cost as well as many who are trying to overcome these cost for better opportunities in urban environments. One of the largest populations groups moving and shaping cities today are Generation Y and Z, depending on the city of study there is either a massive increase or a general growth of this population group. Many seek better career opportunities post-college education with the largest amount of individuals moving into the cities holding a college degree.

The graph to the sideshow that currently there is an increase in the proximity to cities and the population of 25-34-year-olds, some areas experiencing massive growth and others a general decline. Overall the data shows that more people from the younger generation are moving closer and into cities themselves, this can be due to transportation requirements, better job opportunities, or simply dissatisfaction with the suburban model of living.

Generation X: Born between 1965-1979, roughly 82 million Americans.
Young Americans Are Moving Back To City Neighborhoods

Population growth rate among adults 25-34 by distance from city centers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from City Center</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>2010s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 1 miles</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 miles</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 10 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 45 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hyojung Lee (David H. Montgomery / CityLab)

Figure 1
Population growth rate graph
In the United States, there are many different types of cities, three categories listed in the figure, each with different trends of population and migration of different age groups. Magnet cities are the attractors of markets and all different population groups, these are the cities we always hear about and see within TV sitcoms and news reports, overall they are the most sought after and the most expensive to move to, but they have the best offerings from an Urban environment to career opportunities primarily for the college educated. Sunbelt cities are experiencing growth on different scales and in a different manner, cities like Atlanta are seeing an influx of citizens from the Metro area and further for cheaper housing prices, a different Urban model, and new industries which have found their way and established themselves in the city. Sunbelt cities are working to maintain and grow based on their established or to be established industries. Legacy cities are cities which are defined by certain trade or type of work and can be greatly affected by certain economic trends or difficulty within a singular industry, Detroit is an example when the 2008 financial crisis hit and car companies which are the economy of the city needed to be bailed out by the government. These cities have little latitude when it comes to job offerings and the urban environment and is beginning to experience changes in population as the number of college-educated Generation Y and Z members seek opportunities outside of a single-sided economy.
### TABLE 1: CITIES ANALYZED IN THIS RESEARCH BRIEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAGNET CITIES</th>
<th>SUNBELT CITIES</th>
<th>LEGACY CITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn (see note)</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Brooklyn is, of course, part of New York City (although it was a separate city until 1898). Since it is widely seen as the locus of demographic transformation in New York City, we chose to look at it separately, since what may be taking place in that borough is likely to be obscured if citywide data is used.

### TABLE 2: CITY/STATE RATIOS FOR BOSTON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population share 2012</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population share 2000</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of growth 2000-2012</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>GAIN²</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 and Table 4 show an important trend occurring in the United States currently, more people than ever are obtaining their college education, primarily Generation Y and Z, and the cities which are experiencing the most growth are offering jobs which require a college education. Magnet cities have grown in population ratio of 2.53 for 25-34-year-olds with other increases in population groups from 35-65 and older. Typically these cities are experiencing growth, but the rate of younger people moving into these cities compared greatly to other population groups with a 25% increase in college graduated aged 25-34.

Sublet and Legacy cities are seeing similar trends with a difference in the older populations. In Sunbelt cities, there is a larger ratio of 25-34-year-olds moving into cities compared to 35-44-year-olds, but after that, there has been a slight decrease in 45-65 and older. Similarly, Legacy cities are seeing an increase in 25-34-year-olds but a decrease in every other population group. This seems to be attributed to what their economies offer as well as the environments in which people live. Overall the trend presented in younger college-educated Generation Y and Z members are moving into cities which have a diverse economic offering and an urban environment which offered options for transportation and living. The more options for growth, potential, and movement is attracting a demographic which is ready and able to make the jump from the suburbs.
TABLE 3: COMPOSITE POPULATION SHARES BY CATEGORY OF CITY FOR 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MAGNET CITIES</th>
<th>SUNBELT CITIES</th>
<th>LEGACY CITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: ratios shown are average of individual city ratios in each category, not weighted by city population size.

TABLE 4: INCREASE IN COLLEGE-EDUCATED ADULTS BY AGE GROUP FOR UNITED STATES 2000 TO 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER 2000</th>
<th>NUMBER 2012</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>% INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>10,899,873</td>
<td>13,567,437</td>
<td>+2,667,564</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>11,882,123</td>
<td>13,250,617</td>
<td>+1,368,494</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>16,296,602</td>
<td>23,907,407</td>
<td>+7,610,805</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>5,384,007</td>
<td>10,017,061</td>
<td>+4,633,054</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 2: CHANGING DEMOGRAPHIC TRAJECTORIES IN FOUR CITIES

Age groups above the dotted red line are over-represented and below the dotted red line are under-represented in the city's population.
Overall the figure shows the changes in population according to which city is shown. Many of the Magnet and Sunbelt cities are showing large growth of a younger population as well as other groups, many of the Legacy cities are showing population loss as those who are becoming educated in those cities are looking for other economic opportunities not presented by the economies of their city.

Atlanta specifically is showing larger growth in the younger demographic as the city’s economy begins to diversify and the city itself has become more livable through its expansion. With this growth, many developers and areas have begun to experience a larger change in demographics such as the Sweet Auburn and Edgewood areas. Atlanta is a model for how cities can begin to change and shift to accommodate a growing population which seeks greater economic opportunity and a more urban living model.

Currently, most of the new apartments and newly developed areas are priced in a fashion which only attracts college educated salary earning individuals without taking reference from the existing area. Many areas such as Ponce City Market have become a staple image of what the city is turning into both economically but demographically by taking advantage of areas with low property values and eager individuals looking to create a new environment. I am presenting an alternative solution for the college education and blue-collar youth who want to live in the city and move into the city by offering a building prototype which acknowledges the change in demographics but does not aim to disrupt the existing population which has created the history and identity of an area.
### Appendix Table 1: Demographic Ratios for Magnet Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Austin</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Brooklyn</th>
<th>Chicago</th>
<th>Denver</th>
<th>Portland</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Seattle</th>
<th>Washington DC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2012</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2000</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth share (see note)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2012</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2000</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth share</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2012</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2000</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth share</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2012</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2000</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth share</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix Table 3: Demographic Ratios for Legacy Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Baltimore</th>
<th>Buffalo</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Milwaukee</th>
<th>Newark</th>
<th>Philadelphia</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>St. Louis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2012</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of growth</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2012</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of growth</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>LOSS</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>LOSS</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>LOSS</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2012</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of growth</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share 2012</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of growth</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Colors**
- **ABSOLUTE LOSS**: Less than -0.75
- **-0.75**
- **-1.25**
- **-1.75**
- **-2**

Figure 5
Appendix Table 1: Ratios for Magnet City
Appendix Table 3: Ratios for Legacy City
Downtown Atlanta is a new destination for many looking to have a more urban lifestyle or find better job opportunities. Breaking down the statistics of Atlanta helps to give us a better look at who lives in the city currently and what future trends might look like. In terms of income downtown, those age 25-44 make roughly $43,540 compared to those 45-64 making around $54,974 on average. This slight difference and doesn’t make a very lasting impact economically as those who have worked long and had the opportunity to save more money are able to then move around. Households with and without children is a drastic difference, households with children in the city is 1,255 compared to households without being 13,245, showing that most of the people living in the city do so without children, referring back to the notes on Generation Y.2 moving to the suburbs to raise a family, this statistics back that up. Of all the groups of educated individuals in the city, the two highest numbers are those holding bachelors degrees at 6,637 and then graduate degrees at 4,396, the next highest being those with some college experience at 2,398. Continuing a majority of those in the city, 13,700, have never been married compared to 2,437 who are married. Finally, the Median age of those in the city is 27.77 years old, just a couple years of someone who is out of school and looking to create a new life post-graduation.
### Household Income and Average Income in Downtown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Income Under 26</th>
<th>Median Income 25-44</th>
<th>Median Income 45-64</th>
<th>Median Income Over 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$27,513</td>
<td>$43,540</td>
<td>$54,974</td>
<td>$74,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Households in Downtown Atlanta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Family Households</th>
<th>Non-family Households</th>
<th>Households With Children</th>
<th>Households Without Children</th>
<th>Average People Per Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>11,548</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>13,245</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Downtown Atlanta Education Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No High School</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>Bachelors Degree</th>
<th>Graduate Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>6,637</td>
<td>4,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Downtown Atlanta Population Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Male Population</th>
<th>Female Population</th>
<th>Percent Change Since 2000</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32,105</td>
<td>18,938</td>
<td>13,168</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>27.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Occupational Employment in Downtown Atlanta

| White Collar | 31,742 |
| Blue Collar  | 21,888 |
Population Data

These statistics show that a majority of the people in the city are people getting out of colleges with different levels degrees trying to find places to live and work in the city before possibly settle down after getting married and having a kid. This graph helps to visualize what the age gaps look like in downtown Atlanta. Most people in the city are between 22-27 and then later experiencing a larger drop off after turning 35.

Atlanta has a young population looking for new ways to live which attend to the lifestyle which they have created.
Precedents

Patronage Laique, LAPS Architecture + MAB Arquitectura
Paris, France

Carmel Place, nArchitects
New York City, New York

Nakagin Tower, Kisho Kurokawa
Toyko, Japan
Patronage Laique
LAPS Architecture + MAB Arquitectura
Paris, France

This mixed-use building with 30 housing units for young workers and offices for Patronage Laique, a guardian association in Paris’ 15th arrondissement, is a recently delivered project by the MAB+LAPS team for the RIVP Régie immobilière de la Ville de Paris. Located on the corner of Avenue Felix Faure and rue Tisserand, the building sits in the varied environment of the Boucicaut development zone with its orthogonal buildings and Haussmannian vestiges which dot this neighborhood with industrial accents. Occupying the typical Parisian street-corner lot, the building marks the neighborhood with its luminescent front facade day and night. Their holistic approach highlighted the relationship between the city and public space by establishing a strong bond and continuity with the interior of the plot, placing the accent on its public facility character by offering an identifiable landmark. The proposition fosters user-friendliness by creating generous meeting places and favoring an opening onto the city. It responds to the project management’s desire to underscore the accessible and populist nature of this place in order to maintain proximity to its residents. The floor plan and layout of the Patronage Laique is focused on the interactions of the community and residents of the building, the bottom floor offers a program for classes, coffee, and chance interaction. There is a careful separation between certain functions for both the private and public functions, specifically the circulation which allows residents to choose between public interaction on the bottom floor or a private entrance street side. The careful dance between public offerings and private ownership is key and displayed.
Floor Plans

Figure 9
Patronage Laique Floor plans
This mixed-use building with 30 housing units for young workers does a wonderful job balancing public and private interactions, entrances, and exits. The main private entrance is not connected to the interior of the building at all, and it houses the mailroom so no one outside of the key access areas has the ability to access the space from the interior. The bottom floor holds different public programs which share an entrance with a semiprivate cafe, this allows for a blend of those from outside to interact with those who live in the building. Space is divided up so that on the bottom floor no one owns on space public or private, they are shared. The upper floors use the main entrance from the street side with the mailroom as the main means of egress since it meets the needs of all units.

The building performs well in its separation of public-private through selective programming on floor plans, location of units vs public spaces, and circulation of individuals in, out, and through the building.
**Program**

The numbers here show different entrances and programs to the structure. 1 is an entrance to the ground floor with public and private programming flanked by 2 which is the same, allowing for the building to be accessed from both sides of the site and maximize the street corner it is located on. 3 is a point of vertical circulation which helps to connect 4 which is an atrium space almost helping to connect the units to the public ground floors. 5 is the spot for units which sit about the building and allow for shaping and mapping of the building form and how the programs can receive light and attention from the form and users on the inside. The diagram on the next page helps to show the separation between the public and private zones of the building program. Overall the building maximizes the site and separates its program in a way which allows for space and light to interact with other programs which might not interact otherwise or give courtesy to a program which needs it.
Spaces

The program shown is the unit and community space on the second floor. The spaces are open and adaptable depending on what is being asked of the program and giving ample spacing between public and private spaces. The unit helps to divide what might be seen as for everyone and for someone but is still very open and undefined for the most part. The building in section shows how the public programming gives the form good proportions and structure for the units to be built on top of, as well as the separation between public and private programming.
nARCHITECTS designed the exterior and interior spaces of Carmel Place as a repeatable and systemic new paradigm for housing in NYC and other cities with similar housing challenges. Conceived as a microcosm of the city skyline, the building’s exterior resembles four slender “mini towers”, connecting the concept of micro-living to the form and identity of the building. By incorporating setbacks in the design of the stepping “micro-towers”, Carmel Place’s urban form could in principle be adapted to different sites, at a range of heights and floor area ratios, and at nearly any location in a block. The aim was to provide a new social framework for small households that emphasizes nested scales of community rather than individual residents. The 11-foot-wide “towers” reflect this goal by celebrating the beauty of small dimensions, while not highlighting individual micro-units on the exterior. The use of four shades of grey brick makes connections to the project’s local context, while also placing Carmel Place within New York’s long legacy of brick used in housing. The building’s 8’ tall windows, placed in apartments, corridors, and stairs, recall proportions used in New York’s 19th-century brownstones, one of the architect’s references for the building’s interior proportions. Each unit is prefabricated and shipped on site per owner specification. The floor plan is a condensed living model where space is a premium and maximized to bring the square footage down. Each unit has all the program of a typical apartment but organized and sized to be more programmatic. The floor plan is planned in a way to adapt to the changing conditions and needs of the tenant or owner. The living room, kitchen, and balcony all hold secondary functions depending on the private vs public relationship they have towards different programmatic needs of the owner and space.
Floor Plans

**APT. #3A - DAY**
9'-10" high wall surface behind couch used as pin-up wall; kitchen counter is down and ready for a coffee.

**APT. #4D - DUSK**
Preparation for a dinner of 6 is underway.

**APT. #3A - NIGHT**
Convertible sofa-bed folded down; kitchen counter folded up; coffee table on wheels relocated to wall.

**APT. #4D - NIGHT**
Dishes have been cleared, foldable table hung on a rail; Murphy bed folded down from bookshelf; counter also folded down, ready for breakfast tomorrow.
The floor plan for Carmel place is based on two main principles; adaptability and modularity. First, the unit must be able to be transported on a truck and lifted by crane into place during the building’s construction. This means it must be carefully designed and thought out during the entire design process, this allows for the building to be built quickly and units to be customized. Second is that the programming inside the spaces is adaptable depending on the needs for the program. During the morning and afternoon, the bed can be made and put to up create a couch and coffee table, the kitchen island can be extended and create new spatial relationships inside. The idea is that the unit will adapt to the conditions of the resident rather than creating more spaces for the program which might happen less often.
Units

LINEAR STORAGE LOFT
70 cuft.
16" x 1'-10" high x 2'-6" deep: the same volume of storage as a Volkswagen Iegra sportswagen.

BATHROOM/CLOSET
Accessible bathroom with shower; full depth closet.

KITCHEN
70 cuft*.
Efficient factory built kitchen with fold-down table/counter, full height pull-out pantry, full height fridge, range and space for a convection microwave.
*including refrigerator.

JULIETTE BALCONY
63 SF
1'-0" w x 5'-0" h Sliding doors and a laminated glass guardrail.
The program of Carmel place puts all amenities and circulation into one zone with circulation going off to the side and amenities located on the bottom floor. This allows for there to be a straight understanding of circulation but also during construction and design this allows for the units to be maximized in their orientation since they only have to be based on one core and base. The building was created off of the module and its implementation during the construction and operation of the building.
Diagram showing areas and amenities:

- **Green Room**
- **Resident Terrace**
- **Community Room**
- **Areas Amenities**
- **Shared Space**
- **Fitness Center**
- **Patio**
- **Laundry**
- **Bike Storage**
- **Storage**
- **Lobby**
- **Detail**

Diagram illustrates different sections and spaces within a building, indicating various amenities and areas.
Nakagin Tower

Kisho Kurokawa
Tokyo, Japan

The module was created with the intention of housing traveling businessmen that worked in central Tokyo during the week. It is a prototype for an architecture of sustainability and recyclability, as each module can be plugged into the central core and replaced or exchanged when necessary. Built in the Ginza area of Tokyo, a total of 140 capsules are stacked and rotated at varying angles around a central core, standing 14-stories high. The technology developed by Kurokawa allowed each unit to be installed to the concrete core with only 4 high-tension bolts, which keeps the units replaceable. Each capsule measures 4 x 2.5 meters, permitting enough room for one person to live comfortably. The interior space of each module can be manipulated by connecting the capsule to other capsules. All pieces of the pods were manufactured in a factory in Shiga Prefecture then transported to the site by truck. The pre-assembled interior features a circular window, built-in bed, and bathroom, and is furnished with a TV, radio and alarm clock. Hoisted by a crane, the capsules were inserted in the shipping containers by use of a crane, and then fastened to the concrete core shaft. The Nakagin tower focuses the future for what building and urban engagement can look like. The Capsule and central core concept push the boundaries of what architecture can become. Module units which can be installed and removed based on the needs of the owner can be utilized in different ways. Kurokawa shows how the future of architecture can look, and more importantly how the future of architecture can adapt to changing conditions and social needs.
Infrastructure

The Nakagin Tower is one of the few Japanese Metabolist building to be created and later create a new category of hotels in Japan. The building is comprised of two separate cores which serve as a docking station for units. The core still the circulation and the structure behind the building but the units themselves are these capsules which bolt into the core of the building, allowing for them to be removed and installed theoretically. The issue is that they must be lifted by crane into place and then bolted in by someone. The Units are small and modular units which hold everything that a businessman would need during a nights stay in the city. The idea behind the structure is that the units can be removed and installed as needed for upgrades and more, allowing for the building to adapt and follow the model of Metabolism being stated by the Japanese Metabolist and Kurokawa himself.

Figure 17
Nakagin Tower Diagrams
138 Edgewood Ave.
Atlanta, Georgia

Demographic Location
This site allows for those transitioning out of college or moving into the city to be around a population similar in age with activities and program which reflect their interest.

Site limitations
138 Edgewood Ave is a complex site because of its location and context to surrounding buildings. On the Auburn Ave side is a parking lot entrance flanked by the Research Library and Apex Library. The opposite Edgewood side also has a parking lot entrance but is covered from sunlight mostly by the GSU dorm building but intersects with Courtland street to create a street corner which is where the GSU bookstore is. This street corner looks over to Hurt Park and Downtown Atlanta. The Parking lot on site holds 110 spots, and the Research Library uses the back as an entrance which holds its handicap parking.

Demolition and Site Configuration

Demolition
The GSU bookstore and convenience store attached would be demolished along with the parking lot to make room for the building and parking lot foundations. The GSU administration building will be the point extend from to create the footprints for the new buildings with the library keeps everything spaced.
Materials
Special Interest Zoning
This will allow for a great potential of creating a new building prototype with permission to bend some of the rules in place to create something that hasn’t been seen before. This zoning will allow for the ability to experiment with High-Density Mixed-use development and the potential for great architectural experimentation and freedom in design.

Proximity to High-Density areas
Edgewood Avenue is the perfect street to be able to access a large portion of the city, it is a straight shot from downtown to the surrounding suburbs and it even has a connection point with the beltline. Building further down Edgewood closer to downtown allows for more active participation in urban living and is a more suitable choice.

Location to Beltline and Street Car
The beltline is a major ticket item for either leisure or getting around the city by alternative means. This location on Edgewood allows for there to be 4 different modes of transportation: Walking, Biking, Streetcar, or Automobile. Urban mobility and flexibility are key when trying to live a more successful and enjoyable urban life.

Demographic location
This site allows for those transitioning out of college or moving into the city to be around a population similar in age with activities and program which reflect their interest.
Zoning

SP-1 Overview

Apply more effective zoning techniques that have been developed and tested to encourage urban, mixed-use development

Provide development standards for the street environment to enhance the public realm and encourage pedestrian activity throughout Downtown

Eliminate minimum parking requirements (particularly for residential uses), provide Maximum space totals for all uses, reduce off-street loading requirements, expand bicycle and moped parking space requirements

Identify Storefront Streets to create primary pedestrian streets with street-level retail and other pedestrian amenities i.e. shopping streets

Generally, maintain existing commercial Floor Area Ratio (FAR) permission and increase FARs for residential uses.
The Metabolist Model

SCALE, SOCIAL SPACES, CHANGING PROGRAM, INFRASTRUCTURE

138 Edgewood Avenue is a site which borders two very different parts of Atlanta, downtown and the most urban neighborhoods. The site is broken into two zoning districts, Special Interest and Historic District, which presents an issue currently but as zoning changing opportunities are presented. This site is located around an abundant amount of modes of transportation, ranging from the streetcar to biking alternatives. This area experiences a great shift in the program throughout the day to later in the night, supporting college students from GSU and those around Grady to an active bar scene just across the highway. This site offers many of the urban opportunities which my precedent studies capitalize on in a dense urban environment.
Scale

This system is comprised of standardized modular units which are fit into an external structure based off of a grid and is expandable or may be disassembled based on the structure. The idea being every building can be taken down, added onto, and designed at sizes which address the context in which they are being placed. Small 4 Unit structure can be out in the suburbs, a 30 unit structure can be placed in a small city, and even larger urban lofts or high-rises can be created from the system. The system is a global vernacular, it can be adapted to any structure or culture, the main element is a core for support and circulation and a structure to house the capsule units.
The spaces created are meant to focus on the interactions between individual residents and the public. The focus is on Mixed-use development and how it plays a role in daily life in an urban setting. Units are designed and offered in limited formats which can be expanded on later, but the spaces and programs are meant to adapt to the changing social conditions and needs of the unit. The programming of spaces for the public and private is planned in a way to connect and interact.
Programming of this model is made difficult by the building infrastructure which surrounds, moves, and holds the modular units. The system created would have dead spots where the certain program would be deemed mechanical or functional, but holding to Metabolist ideals the spaces are designed just like the units and program to adapt to the needs. Certain areas are channels for the units to be lifted and moved into place taking space, but when not in use they become a social gather space to observe the building and urban area.
Infrastructure

The building’s infrastructure is made of a concrete core and steel exoskeleton which supports the units. The structure also houses the mechanism which moves the units similar to how an elevator would work. This system becomes an expression of the building form, and as units are installed and removed they facade and system change as the social conditions of the residents’ changes. The building’s infrastructure is the main element which program is worked around, whether vertical or horizontal circulation or placement of walls and program from columns.

The unit will be removable from the structure, the unit is ready to install from the factory with a quick connection point which combines all the unit systems and electricity to quick disconnect port when the unit is ready for transferring and removal.
Preliminary Design

The form of the structure on site is characterized by the two building layout and what restrictions are found on site. The largest restriction is the GSU student dorms across the street which creates a shadow on-site limiting what natural sunlight would be received on the Edgewood face of the building. Second would be the site itself which has the Research library and parking lot, due to the needs for moving trucks on site and also keeping to what the research library needs in order to allow for people to walk into the back entrance, the entire site was not dedicated to the site and it was divided into two sections.
Program on-site focuses on the relationship between public and private interactions as well as any site limitations. After establishing what programs would be on the ground level for the public and private it showed the potential for where the building core could be located, and from there programming for the residents was established from shared spaces to private. Finally, the units were added which changed the layout of the floors and form of the building itself and helped to shape and change how the program below was organized.
The Unit was based on the unit design from Carmel place with edits to the sizing of the floor plans to fit the requirements of transport and programmatic additions from being attached to the building. The main focus is to give space needed to the resident which can transform and adapt depending on what is needed from the unit. The building does the same and changes based on the needs of who is present in the structure. The unit shaped the program of the building and sizing for the structure and is the driving factor in how things are arranged. The Unit is meant to be customizable with varying unit layouts based on the needs and wants of the potential residents, this also allows for the exterior form of the building to change shape as different units are installed and housed there. Upgrades can be done to units when needed and they can be moved from site to site since the building infrastructure is the component which moves the units to the trucks. The Unit is meant to be adaptable and customizable for the client while being the more convenient way to move because the units and infrastructure of the building work together to accomplish all those tasks.
Unit

Based on the needs of the resident or client, the layout can be changed and adjusted from adding or subtracting space and program. Urban living limits potential program based on location and cost but having the units constructed as prefabricated elements, the cost can be cut down and the desired program can be achieved. The idea for the unit is to be something to take with you, you can rent, lease or purchase in your ’20s and move it to the best spots in town for work or play. Later on, you can add or change the program within to reflect changing needs of both the space that you live in and live, you might have a significant other living with you or have a roommate or want to have a patio to sit out on as life begins to slow down. The unit is meant to work and adapt for the owner supported by the rest of the system.
Structure

The structure is a standardized based on the dimensions of the unit, comprised of steel I-beam its meant to be assembled and disassembled in association to the buildings life cycle and to also fit the necessary equipment to move the units. The structure is tied into the building core and uses it as a counterweight, while the beams are oversized because the loads on the structure will change as units are moved in and out of the structure in no particular order. The structure and units are bolted together with space on top and one each side so the unit does not rest to rub on any part of the structure with room for any servicing as well as during installation and removal. The structure would also have a quick disconnect for all the functions of the unit; electricity, water, internet, etc. The structure is not meant to be the defining factor of the form but the support element for the units to create a building and form which reflect the environment and individuals who live there, as well as the metabolist ideals of use and adaptation.
Preliminary site location did not comprise of the secondary building facing Auburn ave and the entire site was dedicated to parking and later a parking lot. The goal was to maximize the facade towards Edgewood for public and private interaction while creating a more private setting on the Auburn side. The downfall was the buildings and parking lot situation to the Research Library, there was little consideration to how the program would be affected by the new program. Based on this design the layout for how the building would sit on site and how the units would be trucked in and out of the site was established.
On-Site Secondary

The secondary iteration considered how the units and circulation would work on site. The original goal was to create a single loaded open space which residents could walk into natural lighting and air but it limited the maximum number of units and was not effective in its spatial use. The layout showed in order to create a cost-effective and efficient model more units needed to be installed with shared spaces included.
Edgewood Street Programming

Programming on the ground floor involved creating space that would help the residents and public interact while acknowledging the history and place that the bookstore holds on site. Space is comprised of a first floor which holds the program and a second open-air level which creates a grand gesture to space. The street corner is a Cafe which is open to the public and residents which also holds the leasing office for those who might be interested in what is offered by this model of living, the idea was to give a space for the residents and community to interact and congregate based on lives based on productivity and interaction. Next to that is a retail space which can be outfitted and adjusted to the needs of different businesses to help create a space which the community can come to shop or have a different program which can serve the community. The bookstore is moved further down site but is giving ample space compared to their existing floor area with a first and second floor, it was important to not remove it from the area which it had existed but give it a new life and give the street corner to programming which reflected the new situation of the building on site. Finally is the private entrance for residents where a program such as a mail-room and bike storage helps, this is a space which residents can come and spend a quick moment and have the most immediate needs met from mail to traveling as well as getting to their units with having to walk through a cafe.
Auburn Avenue Programming

Compared to the Edgewood building, the focus shifted from what could be offered in terms of both public and private interaction and more of a space which was more attentive to the residents on site. The programming on the ground floor is solely for the residents since it has the least amount of street real estate compared to Edgewood. The main programming incorporated was a maintenance office, an open studio lounge for residents who want a larger space to work or meet with people than their units as well as a gym. These programs can be found elsewhere in the community but rather than offer ever amenities the focus was what would be the most effective on site and use the floor area effectively.
The Prototype
Parking Levels

The parking level holds 120 spots for the residents but has a small amount for those going to the research museum. The focus was to offer spaces between the structural components of the building where residents can park and easily get to their units.
The first level and site focus on what can be maximized on site, a open park area if given to the most private programming on site with plenty of space given to the research library and its needs programmatically, and their is spacing form the existing buildings for trucks to move in and out for unit installation and removal. The final floor plan helps to further separate the private and public interactions where needed and offer the residents the most convenient access to the structure.
The third level different from every unit about it because it has fixed units in place ranging from studio layouts to three bedrooms. This is to offer spaces for those looking to have roommates but more importantly to offer an affordable living component to the building rather than not referencing the affordable housing crisis. On the ends of each floor is a community laundry area with the building circulation divide down the middle and on each end of the structures.
Adaptability is the main focus of the fourth floor since the units move between the building structure there needs to be both horizontal and vertical shafts for the units to move, these create an opportunity for the program to be filled into space and the fourth floor is where the units move horizontally on site. Rather than restrict the area it is used as a patio space which can be used by the residents and rented out for events.
The units define the fifth floor and show how the building core works with the infrastructure. Similar to the fourth floor there needs to be a vertical shaft which the units can be moved in and out of the building, this is not only a good way to space out units but allow light into the corridor when exiting the units. Again community space is given on the ends of the floor but the focus of these level is to get and support the units.
Eighth Level

The upper levels show the building form as it rises when creating or planning for these structures the orientation and location of rent-able spaces for the units can be a defining factor in how they may be priced. Depending on the design this floor can grow taller and create different building forms compared to this mid-rise layout.
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Figure 1 - https://www.citylab.com/equity/2018/07/will-millennials-stay-downtown/566078/
Figure 2 - https://www.communityprogress.net/filebin/Whos_Moving_to_Cities_Who_Isnt_Research_Brief_Mallach_September_2014.pdf
Figure 3 - https://www.communityprogress.net/filebin/Whos_Moving_to_Cities_Who_Isnt_Research_Brief_Mallach_September_2014.pdf
Figure 4 - https://www.communityprogress.net/filebin/Whos_Moving_to_Cities_Who_Isnt_Research_Brief_Mallach_September_2014.pdf
Figure 5 - https://www.communityprogress.net/filebin/Whos_Moving_to_Cities_Who_Isnt_Research_Brief_Mallach_September_2014.pdf
Figure 6 - https://www.point2homes.com/US/Neighborhood/GA/Atlanta/Downtown-Atlanta-Demographics.html
Figure 7 - http://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/atlanta-population/
Figure 8 - https://www.archdaily.com/602157/new-york-to-complete-first-prefabricated-micro-apartments-this-summer
Figure 9 - https://www.archdaily.com/602384/patronage-laique-and-social-housing-laps-architecture-mab-arquitectura
Figure 10 - https://www.archdaily.com/602384/patronage-laique-and-social-housing-laps-architecture-mab-arquitectura
Figure 11 - https://www.archdaily.com/602384/patronage-laique-and-social-housing-laps-architecture-mab-arquitectura
Figure 12 - https://www.archdaily.com/602157/new-york-to-complete-first-prefabricated-micro-apartments-this-summer
Figure 13 - https://www.archdaily.com/602157/new-york-to-complete-first-prefabricated-micro-apartments-this-summer
Figure 14 - https://www.archdaily.com/602157/new-york-to-complete-first-prefabricated-micro-apartments-this-summer
Figure 15 - https://www.archdaily.com/443609/nakagin-capsule-tower-a-prototype-for-today-s-micro-housing
Figure 16 - https://www.arch2o.com/nakagin-capsule-tower-kisho-kurokawa/
Figure 17 - http://archeyes.com/nakagin-capsule-tower-kisho-kurokawa/

All Black and White Street Photography photos are provided by myself, Andrew Mesa from 2015-2018
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