

## NO MORE COHOUSING, BUT STILL COHOUSING

Jacopo Gresleri

For some time there has been a dizzying increase in publications about collaborative housing (specifically on cohousing), described and studied from the architectural perspective, but even more from the managerial and generative processes point of view.

Through their own algorithms, academic social-platforms offer almost daily new contributions from researchers engaged in the investigation of development, constitution and management methods of these forms of collective housing. The role of stakeholders and users is analyzed, how the groups are defined and created, feasible financing solutions, etc. in a positivist perspective of an alleged, progressive, quantitative increase of realizations of the as such considered most attractive housing solution of recent times. In fact, cohousing is more and more disclosed as the great innovation of the 21<sup>st</sup> century in the housing field, and it is intended as the possible socio-ecologically sustainable alternative which is able to move financiers, administrations and residents' interests. Further, it is also meant to be able to – as the well-known American scholar Dorit Fromm argues (2012) – redevelop neglected neighborhoods, rebuild weakened social relationships, provide personalized services etc. It evokes wide margins of growth of a phenomenon that is actually rather contained and apparently not able to significantly modify the market, nor the mentality of future buyer-residents. In 2015, Paolo Ceccarelli, UNESCO Chair on Urban and Regional Planning for Sustainable Local Development, had already observed that «current orthodox cohousing is a niche phenomenon, both when it is the result of common cultural and ecological choices, and when it is motivated by economic facts. It is a phenomenon of limited quantitative weight, [...] it has not given rise to new architectural solutions, nor has it produced significant innovations in the spatial organization of the city» (Ceccarelli 2015, 10-11).

On several occasions it has also been demonstrated that the difficulty in creating cohousing and communities of residents is first of all economic, financial, legal and administrative hurdles, and also

relational among a restricted group of people, “forced” to analyze and choose each other carefully, on pain of failure of the entire operation. This makes them «not dissimilar from the much opposed “gated community”, [...] and if [cohousing] is open to the rest of the population, it remains an individual element, unable to change the structure of a city or a part of it» (Ceccarelli 2015, 13).

We also know that this condition is roughly generalizable to all of the countries in which the mentioned model is spreading but it mostly characterizes those in which the North European archetypes have come to be defined. It mainly deals with those countries where the solution of shared housing has been embraced “faithfully”, characterizing it so much to originate the three well-known models (Swedish, Danish and Dutch), about which I have already written on other circumstances (Gresleri 2015, 2017, 2018). However, (mainly) the European countries and the administrations of their cities seem to be chasing the cohousing model, attracted by the positive image of the *vivre ensemble* described in the Seventies by Roland Barthes. Those institutions seem to be yearning to add the collaborative housing to the already widespread and tested traditional forms of private and collective housing.

The reason for this interest would certainly deserve an in-depth analysis (quantitative, qualitative, normative, etc.), but at least one aspect is evident, and it needs to be stated here. The economic crisis, which continues to pervade Europe differently from country to country (but to tell the truth, not only in the Old Continent), has revealed not only the difficulty of accessing the traditional home market, but also the rediscovery of relational needs, values and welfare, that are clearly understood as absent or limited.

The two implications weave together on different levels, revamping the design and realization of *social* housing, a solution that has been developing to fill the gap in real estate offers towards that bracket of users who are neither sufficiently disadvantaged to be able to access the assignment list for council houses, nor enough well-off to turn to the free private market. According to statistics, it is a portion of population that is numerically growing, which affects both real estate entrepreneurship and public administrations. But among the multiple consequences of the rediscovered relational values and the renewed needs of services, we must also report the development of *collaborative* housing, which introduces itself to scholars with different and (sometimes) innovative solutions. In these cases, the joining factor (often highlighted by

the prefix “-co”) seems to draw the interest of future inhabitants ready to “sacrifice” a part of their housing privacy in return of a wider range of collective services. This model, however, attracts local administrations too, which increasingly promote the creation of housing solutions where users are able to manage themselves in terms of both economic and services autonomy. We try – so it seems – to make a virtue of necessity, but often (re)proposing housing models that are already partially known, now introduced in new forms and with new names where the aforementioned prefix “-co” can never miss (has not to!), in order to obtain the desired consensus.

Despite the obvious contradictions, the housing proposal based on sharing and collaboration – in its broadest meaning – remains extremely interesting for the great potential so far unexpressed, and it is on the unexplored possibilities that I believe the challenge for the cohousing model survival will be played in the future, as well as its implementation.

In the mid-Fifties of the last century, the entrepreneurial initiative of Olle Engkvist for the construction of the Hässelby Family Hotel in Stockholm, started a season of great experimentation regarding the size, management and architectural solutions of cohousing, a period that lasted over 30 years and culminated with the birth of the so-called *Self-work Model* by BIG, a feminists group led by Elly Berg who intuited and developed those solutions which are commonly adopted as a guideline for the design of modern cohousing and senior cohousing too (which probably is the more successful solution in the field of collaborative housing).

As it happened then, so it is happening today: having now “codified” the design variables, in my opinion an interesting unexplored evolutionary phase is opening, dealing with the relationship between individual cohousing buildings and communities and the wider urban environment where they integrate, both in terms of personal relationships and creation of public space. It is right that relationship whose absence is reported by Ceccarelli, and so far cohousing (and collaborative housing in general) has shown to have no declared end with, having as its main purpose the constitution of the (private) community of residents. It is by definition, in fact, a self-reference model, which focuses on its social capital and which seems to show a gradual refusal, a physical departure, almost a distance from the city that hosts them, from a social

structure called into question by softened antagonism behaviors. As it happened to the pioneers in the epic Far West, those residents “renounce” the life *of* (and *in*) the city to look for a new one, tailored, where to replicate on a small scale the collaborative and community mechanisms of the small villages, promoting solidarity actions and mutual exchange, but still within the boundary of their own community.

In order to mitigate these expressions of (self) segregation, Fromm (2012) identifies three characteristics that she considers essential in the direction of achieving the “virtuous” example: 1) the presence of in-between spaces (in particular at ground floor) between the residences' private units, but also between the housing complex and the external neighborhood community; 2) the design of the settlement edges, to allow for and favor the – not to be taken for granted third characteristic – 3) a willingness of openness towards the external community.

Therefore, as regards this last point, the cohesion between a community of “chosen” and the rest of the city is built starting from the declaredly will expressed by the residents: but too little to guarantee a possible contribution of urbanity. Also the widely used design guidelines (Berg 1982, Caldenby 1984, McCamant & Durrett 2011, Fromm 1991, ScottHanson 2005) are mainly aimed at promoting the proliferation of new social meetings and relationships among residents, while it still misses the *inclusive* component towards those people who are not members of the community itself.

So, what kind of society can we imagine if we exponentially endorse the Scandinavian model? Which city should we design, as architects, being aware of the results of our reflections, having found the absence of solutions which could be able to guarantee the success of a cohousing and its “integration” into the city? I think the main goal that has to be reached is the *private engagement in public space design*, the contribution of the individual to everyone's space, because, as Bruno Zevi said (1979, 89), «the product of an architect is rarely an isolated “piece”, a singular sentence, standing alone».

It is the example of the portico, a place of commingling between public and private use, a place of reduced extension but potentially unlimited, thanks to the possible repetition of a basic module (the bay), an ordinary “compromise” between public administration and citizen with whom, in turn of the concession to increase the lot or an existing building volume, the free passage (for public use) on this (private) land is

requested. This is how, during the 13<sup>th</sup> century in Italy, the portico changed from private use occupying public land to public use occupying a private space.

On the contrary, by observing the relationship between collective spaces and residence in the three archetypal cohousing models, we can clearly see that all of them propose a self-referential relationship, an idea of centripetal space sharing – unlike what happens in the solution of the portico which instead it emphasizes its permeability, the crossing possibility for every user. An example, the portico, which must be assimilated as a possible approach to the study of the relationships between *community and public space*, as one of the desirable contributions that collaborative housing can provide to the realization of urban space: building for a common use *too*. Because, as the Smithsons argued, «community facilities are the raw materials for the construction of social space» (Risselada 2017, 89): collective facilities as organized, planned elements, designed to create social space.

The word “living” in Italian is “abitare”. It derives from the Latin *habitare*, intensive of *habere* (to have), and reveals its assonance with *habitus* (dress, but also behaviour, appearance), and with *abitudine* (habit). The action of being together, experiencing a place, is expressed in the *dominion* of that place, but also in the *attitude* towards that place, in the rules of coexistence, in the use of it (possession, indeed). We can say, then, that we make cities if we create a space suitable for relationships, if we possess it commonly, and if we use it judiciously.

Hence, cohousing could be conceived as – but in general the whole collaborative housing – a constituent and essential part of the modern public space: the State and local administrations, could encourage the development and realization of these models through incentives and, in return, ask for spaces for public use, which integrate these residential solutions into the city. As the celebrated passages described by Walter Benjamin, they could shape a virtuous network of buildings, places for living and for relationships (*habitare* and *habitus*, possession and rules). A network which could be expanded much further the neighborhood border, interesting both urban and suburban areas, *spaces and services infrastructure*, a manifest reference for public and private collective activities (e.g. cycle-lab, D-I-Y workshop, shared kitchen, short time kindergarden, “social concierge”, bike rent etc.). They should be intended to be partially open to

different users while generating economic activity, as similar to the interesting Italian examples of Corte Isolani, within Palazzo Isolani in Bologna, or the wonderful ParkHotel Laurin's garden in Bolzano.

It is not about transforming a private house into a municipal services center, but developing a formula for negotiating a wider participation in public affairs. Once again, the Smithsons come to mind: in their project for the London Economist headquarters where they designed a private but public access raised square on a private ground-floor garage. Or, further, in the plan they developed for Berlin (described in “Wild Wege / Wild Ways”), where they hypothesized the reuse of the abandoned railway network to create a connective structure spread throughout the city, unbuilt and earmarked for public green space, a «green potential lacing through a city» (Risselada 2017, 101).

Therefore, collaborative housing could *also* become the energetic fly-wheel for a virtuous and co-operative microeconomics which could in turn promote, just like the portico in the European Middle Ages, new (social and economic) relationships and new urban spaces. Rather than collaborative housing we could then speak of “co-generative” housing, a solution that could keep together both individual and collective well-being, in a wider productive interpretation than the enclosed one, within the perimeter of the lot (thus replying also to Fromm's request about the boundaries design). Because, as Martin Heidegger argued (Vattimo 1976, 103), «the limit is not what a thing stops on, but [...] it is what a thing starts its presence from».

In short, collaborative housing (and cohousing in particular, as its most widespread expression) should also be envisioned as a sort of urban laboratory, a precious opportunity to verify the feasibility on a wider scale of the solutions put into practice in it, a place for reflections and forward-looking, wishful thinking, designs. But this all requires a vision of the city and a policy of its management that looks beyond an increasingly popular and easy, temporary consensus.

- Berg, E. et al. (1982) *Det lilla kollektivhuset. En modell för praktisk tillämpning*. Stockholm: T14, Byggforskningsrådet.
- Caldenby, C. & Wallden, Å (1984) *Kollektivhuset Stacken*. Göteborg: Korpen.
- Ceccarelli, P. (2012) *Introduzione*. In Gresleri, J. (2012). *Cohousing. Esperienze internazionali di abitare*

*condiviso*. Busalla: Plug in.

- Coste, C (ed.) (2002) *Roland Barthes, Comment vivre ensemble. Cours et séminaires au Collège de France (1976-1977)*. Paris: Seuil Imec.
- Fromm, D. (1991) *Collaborative communities: cohousing, central living and other new forms of housing with shared facilities*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Fromm, D. (2012) Seeding Community: Collaborative Housing as a Strategy for Social and Neighbourhood Repair, *Building Environment*, 38, 3, 364-394.
- Gresleri, J. (2012) *Cohousing. Esperienze internazionali di abitare condiviso*. Busalla: Plug in.
- Gresleri, J (2017) *Attorno al cohousing: l'abitare collaborativo*, in Galdini R., Marata A. (a cura di), *La Città Creativa*, Roma: CNAPPC, p. 133-139.
- Gresleri, J. (2018) *Ceci n'est pas un «coho»*, in *PHOENIX. Il Padiglione de L'Esprit Nouveau tra ricostruzione e restauro*, Bologna: Centro Stampa Regione Emilia Romagna p. 179-194.
- Risselada, M. (2017) (ed.) *The Space Between. Alison and Peter Smithson*. Köln: Verlag der Buchhandlung Walter König.
- ScottHanson, C. & ScottHanson, K. (2005) *The CoHousing Handbook: Building a Place for Community*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.
- Vattimo, G. (a cura di) (1976) *Martin Heidegger. Saggi e discorsi*. Milano: Mursia.
- Zevi, B. (1979) *Architettura in nuce*. Firenze: Sansoni.

## Captions

001.pdf: The “co-generative housing” network within the city and its suburbs. A real connection of spaces-services-facilities.

002.pdf: Conceptual representation of a “cogenerative housing”: (public) leisure spaces, collective housing and facilities, shared production spaces, become a single entity but never un-related with the whole city.

003.tiff: A snapshot under the porticoes in Bologna: through the transversal section you can read private space and services, semi-private space (the portico), public space (the square). Socialization, meeting, trades, walking spaces are totally mixed together.

004.tiff: The portico hosts different activities, depending on its largeness, and it joins different street levels in the city.