Habitable Interstices: In the Shadow of the Jeffersonian Grid

MARILYS R. NEPOMECHIE
Florida International University

TO FILL A GAP
INSERT THE THING THAT CAUSED IT -
BLOCK IT UP
WITH OTHER - AND 'TWILL YAWN THE MORE -
YOU CANNOT SOLDER AN ABYSS
WITH AIR

THERE IS A PAIN - SO UTTER -
IT SWALLOWS SUBSTANCE UP-
THEN COVERS THE ABYSS WITH TRANCE-
SO MEMORY CAN STEP
AROUND - ACROSS - UPON IT-
– *Emily Dickinson*[1]

This essay describes the intellectual framework for a senior undergraduate design studio taught in the spring semester of 1999 at Florida International University. Addressing the "cultural, economic and political forces that define our urban design attitudes and strategies"[2] the studio investigated the generative potential of residual, interstitial spaces along the service alleys that define the interior of the urban block in the Miami Beach Art Deco Historic District. It explored the legitimacy of such spaces as the plausible sites of urban habitation, suggesting myriad ways in which conflicting aspects of the historic and contemporary American city might coexist. The study developed from an interest in exploring the "tensions, ambiguities and contradictions"[3] inherent in the transformation of existing (protected) historic urban fabrics, as a result of prevailing development strategies that press for increased density—while blithely ignoring its effects. Subtext to such interventions are important but seldom articulated cultural clashes that, in the body of urban built form, pit disparate value systems against one another: On the one hand (and specifically in Miami Beach, for instance), the apparent opposites represented by a historic district prized and protected primarily as artifact/ commodity (and thus as the tool of gentrification), set against the high-density, aggressively developed contemporary city that simultaneously threatens and depends upon the preservation and success of that very district.[4] On the other hand stand the physical facts of a parallel, gritty, urban netherworld of the disenfranchised, silently straddling/ inhabiting the forgotten spaces between history and invention.

The studio adopted a critical stance toward competing issues of development and preservation, proposing not simply to fill empty lots and replace existing structures in the historic district with new construction, but rather to investigate those shadow networks[5] of the existing city—its mid-block alley infrastructure and residual spaces—as the potential locus of an alternative urbanism. Here, the studio posited, in the uncharted territory between the historically protected and the carefully "contextual", a largely independent, darkly private "back door" world might find legitimate voice, while forging a tenuous coexistence with the highly publicized, much-photographed "front door" worlds of media, fashion and tourism. Specifically, the studio looked to *collage/montage* as instruments and strategy for the development of viable responses to the complex questions raised by proposing new architectural programs for re(dis)covered interstitial spaces that were defined by the studio as the silent alter egos of our cities.

The student work, contemplating a series of interventions in an historic American city of the early twentieth century[6], served as an ideal vehicle to explore aspects of the American urban condition. Their proposals for territory accruing to the service alleys of the Miami Beach Deco District reinterpreted a series of mid-block sites of ambiguous morphology and complex ownership status in the historic center of the barrier island. These rear-of-lot spaces, zoning-mandated setbacks, roof tops and shallow basements comprised a terrain rendered residual (if not outright invisible), by accepted planning and zoning practices as well as by physical and social changes within the city over the 80 years. The projects modified certain of those infrastructure networks that can potentially sustain the renewal of analogous urban spaces. Such complex initiatives blur distinctions between public responsibility and private interests mirroring the intricacies of the contemporary city, which in turn are reflections of those forces that give it form.

A (New) New World Urbanism

Enumerating the distinctive characteristics of a uniquely American urbanism, Alex Kreiger has noted that throughout the nineteenth century, while traditional European and colonial cities began to be painstakingly transformed by industrialization, American cities were still largely under construction. As a result, they appeared to offer possibilities for "circumventing the chaos experienced by their European counterparts in the face of rapid growth and mechanization."[7] In the course of the twentieth century, however, the fabric of the American central city has accumulated sufficient critical mass to begin sharing some of the infrastructure difficulties that have long bedeviled its Euro-

pean and colonial New World predecessor.[6] Among many such, and although much of its population has continued its penchant for suburban flight, the American city is increasingly overwhelmed by growing density and by the automobile.

While contemporary American, colonial New World and European city centers find themselves negotiating some similar technological quandaries in their search for answers to these difficulties, they exhibit vastly different mechanisms for recording the morphological transformations that solutions to these problems demand. The American city, dominated by the Jeffersonian grid, ironically finds both its most public and most private spaces in the unbuilt places within that grid.[8,9] The lack of constancy in the American urban section has reinforced the street-as-connector as the dominant public experience in the urban landscape, while the corollary concept of building-as-object-within-the-grid has given rise to the inevitability of residual space.[10] Alex Krieger speaks of the American city as a "transient city". What survives best in what Jean Paul Sartre, on a visit to America in 1955, termed the nation's "moving landscape" are not buildings or places, but rather connectors, or venues for movement. In America, Krieger writes, streets precede their defining edges. Unlike their European and colonial counterparts, which are defined largely by the fabric that surrounds them, the voids of American streets assume artefactual properties that render them tangible, autonomous, three-dimensional.[11]

In the American city, the relationship of the urban grid to the individual lot has offered possibilities for responding to the pressures of contemporary technological advancement by a strategy of demolition and substitution: The past "does not manifest itself in American cities through public monuments (as it often does in European and colonial predecessors), but through survivals ... no one has taken the time to tear them down. The presence of historical artifacts is an indication not of reification, but of work to be done."[12] Historically, and, some would argue, as a matter of principle,[13] the American city has favored an inclination for building upward from a clean slate. Perhaps, in the tradition of Frederick Jackson Turner, the instinct to begin anew is but one aspect of an American reluctance to surrender the possibility of perennially reinventing itself, to be bound by the weight of its own form, to be too-accurately quantified or too clearly defined.[14] Perhaps because it has placed greater hope on the as-yet-unknown possibilities of its future, the American city has repeatedly devalued its own artefactual characteristics and thus, rising legions of historic preservationists might argue, its own past.[15]

By contrast, the colonial New World city (like its European counterpart), accommodates the changes wrought by a new technology not by substitution, but by allowing itself to become the foundation for new interventions. Because it does not operate on a grid, but rather on the regularity of building heights and street frontages, it has the ability to create figural spaces. The emphasis there is not on individual buildings, but on their collective aggregation; streets, urban blocks and squares are the predominant public spaces in a continuous fabric built incrementally over long periods of time.[16] Here, residual urban space is virtually non-existent—absorbed, either as solid or collective void, into the very body of the city fabric.

What follows, in the body of work of a senior undergraduate design studio at Florida International University, is an argument for interventions in contemporary American cities that refrain from demanding massive alteration of their surrounding context in order to establish alternative urban intentions. The premium placed upon maintenance of the existing fabric in the Miami Beach Art Deco District by virtue of its protected status, unwittingly creates a unique opportunity for a post-structuralist critique of long-standing American planning tactics traditionally dependent on the Jeffersonian grid and the object building:[17] The studio explores the possibility of reinterpreting aspects of a European urban "fabric" strategy, to fit a contemporary American urbanism bent far more clearly upon increasing density than on generating figural space. Although the studio projects described here are intended for specific urban sites in historic Miami Beach, the intellectual framework that guides their making suggests the possibility of investigating parallel strategies for building the American city. Leveling a measure of criticism at master narratives of American urban development, the studio proposes that American cities might look to European and colonial models for a mechanism that registers evolution without destruction. Student projects suggests that while it searches for means to express its heterotopic condition, the American city might pay particular attention to alternative strategies for inhabiting those residual spaces that mark the course of its making. Specifically, this is an argument for the redefinition of that residual urban space that is the hallmark of a peculiarly American urbanism, comprised of interrelated, but independent, object structures.

Convinced of a need to establish the studio proposals as intrinsic parts of Miami Beach —parts that speak to the collective memories of the city even as they responds to its contemporary needs— the teaching bias of the studio advocated a design strategy based loosely on the nineteenth century concept of "the city as museum,"[18,19] and thus on *collage/montage*. Students were encouraged to draw together "bits and pieces from various heterogeneous systems of objects and buildings" in order to generate "an alternative reality, a critique of reality."[20] That approach supposed an assembly of disparate parts that presents a momentary illusion of seamlessness, but that can always disintegrate into its diverse contradictory elements. In the junctures between its incompatible parts, in the "by-product of the technique" of assembly, lies its identity: For *Collage/ montage,* which ruptures the Modernist unity between form and content, makes multiple meanings possible.[21]

The Miami Beach projects drew upon the machine aesthetic of the mid-block service alley, upon the forms of rear-of-lot servant quarters, of exterior catwalks, open fire escapes and cyclone fencing, of rooftop terraces and fly-by-night shelters, upon the historic forms, materials and colors of regional artisanship, upon the relationship between city and ocean, city and bay, city

and civic space, city and open green space — to discover a new identity for the alleys of Miami Beach that incorporated the ghosts and echoes of its past lives, while possibly laying a groundwork for its future. They provided examples of intermediate scale interventions that effectively embraced the changing morphology of the city by contemplating complex composite buildings which recovered lost spaces in the city, engaging existing structures and proposing relationships to context best understood in section.[22] These proposals suggested that by exploring contemporary city growth sectionally, disparities between the collective fabric and the individual building, between the urban scale and the scale of the single structure, may be successfully mitigated. Moreover, by exploring forms that, cutting across boundaries of privilege, hoped to embody the histories and collective experiences of a place, the projects spoke to the challenges posed by residual urban spaces to traditional meanings of public, community and citizen.

Architectural Design 8: Morphology of the Block: Exploring Interstitial/Residual Urban Space in the Mid-Density Tropical City

The alleys of the Miami Beach historic district are a shadow network to the streets, avenues and boulevards that traditionally define the city. They are largely undeveloped places of often remarkable *outre* aesthetics, typically invisible to most passers-by and secondary to the buildings which they serve. Characteristically, they are home to power poles, gas meters and trash receptacles, service parking, laundry machines and chain link fences, and the otherwise homeless seeking shelter from an inhospitable –and increasingly unaffordable— 'legitimate' city.[23] In parts of the Beach, these alleys have recently become home to by after-hours nightclubs and eateries, open long after the more conventional city venues have closed, and active well into the wee hours of the morning. Frequented by legions of hardy, in-the-know urban foragers, the survival of these places suggest that the neglected residual spaces that collect along the alleys—unregulated by zoning or planning ordinances, but restricted by the fact that they exist behind protected, historic buildings—might take on a significantly different aspect. The recovery of such spaces, their identification as viable sites for building, and the character of their development are questions whose answers may provide a key to the evolution of a critical—and alternative—urbanism.

The studio described here undertook a series of independently structured design projects sited along and within these alleys. They introduced a series of program elements and building types to the service passageways, plumbing the range of possible relationships between the alley and the city. The project proposals became iconographically specific instances of a broader argument for interventions in the city that work sectionally within the historic urban fabric to enhance it. The student proposals argued for a design strategy based on *collage/montage,* tempered by exhaustive readings of the site(s), which explicitly recognized both the complex intricacies and the multiple layers of a unique context. Although tangential problems were addressed throughout the term, the larger portion of the semester was spent in the design and development of solutions to some of the urban and tectonic problems (and possibilities) posed by the competing forces simultaneously at work in the Miami Beach Art Deco Historic District. Among them: The pressures of development interests to increase density in an area of high economic value, the restrictions to development imposed by the very same historic district status that makes that area both highly desirable and economically attractive, and the nature of the residual space in which that new development might, in the absence of other possibilities, take place.

Instructional objectives for the semester were varied. Students were challenged to understand the morphology of the *interior* of the urban block—in an historic district largely defined by its periphery. They did so by posing critical challenges to both the site and its proposed program: What tectonic issues should be addressed if the existing built fabric that defines the block is both historically protected *and* of a smaller scale than that which is ordinarily sought by contemporary developers/ investors? What are the socio-economic issues in the proposition that one might build *behind* the existing buildings that define the streets of the city (said streets understood as the recognizable entities that in many ways delineate a protected historic district)? What is the nature of the spaces being proposed for inhabitation? Currently, whose realm are they? What happens to these persons? Activities? Conditions—as a result of development? What defines public and private space in the city? What happens to those definitions in the context of the proposals being considered here? What relationships can be posited/ suggested between contemporary infrastructure and an existing built fabric? Between infrastructure and private space? Between infrastructure and public space?

Through individually directed investigations, students sought to test the viability of a broad range of historic and contemporary models potentially pertinent to their inquiry: the parasite building, the infill structure, the addition, the casbah, the rear-of-lot "servant" residence, the additive structure and the hybrid building—as well as the typologies associated with the building programs that they were asked to identify and define for themselves: The (automobile) storage building, the youth hostel, the SRO (Single Room Occupancy), the eatery, the nightclub, the tattoo parlor, the 24-hour copy place, the hidden garden. Their work demanded that they understand the parameters that defined the Art Deco Historic District in order to push the envelope of that definition, understanding that the goal was to allow such districts to be not museums, but simultaneously *protected* and *evolving* contemporary urban constructs. They looked at possible means for understanding context in order to introduce new building types to the historic district without replicating the surrounding architectonic parameters.

Although the studio focused on built and unbuilt space conditions along the alleys of two prescribed contiguous blocks in the heart of the historic district (13th Street to Espanola Way, Washington Avenue to Collins Avenue), students were asked to choose their own individual locations for intervention within the two-block area. The work of the semester, which began with a variety of research assignments, led to an array of discoveries that set the parameters for student design explorations. These, in turn, drew upon student documentation of existing zoning restrictions, the possible range of property ownership arrangements, the viability of leasing/purchasing air rights form public and private entities for construction, and the legal means for reassembling portions of already platted properties. In addition to exhaustive photographic records of the site, students produced measured drawings and highly detailed models of the two city blocks (including power poles, fences and the occasional tree). Their research clarified urban structure as well as the construction of individual buildings existing on the site.

Working in teams, students chronicled the history of planning in the Deco District, noting the fact that its service alleys run from south to north, beginning at the southernmost tip of the barrier island, and bifurcating contiguous city blocks whose long dimensions are oriented parallel to the Atlantic Ocean and Biscayne Bay coasts. Typically 15 feet in width and (officially) host only to one-way vehicular traffic, they are City-owned easements for public access to a variety of services, ranging from power and telephone distribution to trash pick-up and fire protection. Properties that abut them are characteristically absolved from maintaining rear setbacks, and height restrictions along the alleys are virtually non-existent. In the most intensely commercial areas of the city, where side setbacks are not required, the alleys are accessible only by means of their northern and southern extremities –or through the existing buildings that abut them. In areas of the city where side setbacks require buildings to stand apart from one another, narrow east-west corridors allow views from the inner world of the alley to the Ocean and Bay shores beyond.

In much of the Beach, these alleys exist behind historic structures whose architectural integrity the City's Historic Preservation and Design Review Boards are entrusted to protect. Since the street remains the principal definer of the public realm in historic South Beach, historic district regulations seldom reach beyond the perceived impact of proposed structures on that street. Interestingly, students discovered that although City ordinances precluded the demolition (or significant alteration) of protected structures, it was possible to legitimately build behind them –or even above them—so long as the addition was invisible to a six-foot tall observer looking at it perpendicularly from across the street it fronts. As streets on South Beach are relatively narrow, it became apparent to the class that considerable vertical construction was at least legally possible. Inquiries at the City also revealed that building officials, even if not the final arbiters of such questions, would be willing to entertain the possibility that private parties might lease or purchase air rights over the City-owned alleys for development –so long as adequate clearance was allowed for the passage of garbage trucks and (small) fire/rescue vehicles. And the mechanisms for assembling property in unconventional ways appeared to be negotiable at larger scales of development.

In response, the buildings developed by the students suggested complimentary infill strategies for mid-block conditions: All addressed, in some fashion, a unique condition of growing urban density that forces an ambiguity in the traditional relationship between building front and street. Most, but not all the projects suggested the interior of the lot as the new, (true?) building front and focused attention on the continuous landscape condition of the interior of the urban block as seen from the perspective of the service alley. All the projects tackled issues of contextualism and historic preservation at urban and building scales: Each stretched the boundaries of the building typologies and the urban codes that were simultaneously implicit and explicit in their immediate and larger surrounds. In these conditions, some of the projects found evocative parameters for an exploration of experiential variety within the confines of smallness –while others explored more daring possibilities for generating vertical public space in a manner that reframed the significance of both the street and the protected historic structures that defined it. In each project, the compressed landscape of the mid-density historic district afforded opportunities for a redefinition of urban space.

The studio produced a broad range of solutions to the problems of development in the "fourth wall". Eleonora Vasiliadis proposed a youth hostel for one of the two city blocks —a long, low, sinuous parasite building that grew from the existing historic and non-contributing structures, suggesting the inhabitation of air space over the service alley, and allowing clear passage for trash and fire vehicles. The structure both extended (and borrowed usage of) existing exterior stairs and horizontal catwalks for access. Invisible from either primary or secondary street and transforming the alley beneath it, the solution developed from an intensive three-dimensional exploration/ excavation of the project site that allowed her to interpret the *ad hoc* character of existing construction in the alley, detailing the relationship between old and new structures and suggesting an architectural language to respond to the uniqueness of that condition.

Similarly interested in disappearing into the interstices between existing buildings and evoking the impermanence of a homeless street existence, Jorge Bernal chose to propose a soup kitchen, a book store/ bar and a tattoo parlor in discovered (and discarded, by most of the class) narrow spaces between existing buildings. Twisting and bending vertically for light, and grafting new structural elements upon existing bearing walls to support the new additions, his project proposed to be dismantled at will.

Malcom Giblin and Daniel Romero offered solutions that defied zoning restrictions, vertically stacking sizable program and granting public access to communal roof spaces at the rear of existing commercial and residential lots partially occupied by historic buildings. Such strategies legitimated the rear of an

urban lot as a site for inhabitation, defining semi-private exterior common spaces between existing buildings and new ones. Because the new projects were largely commercial and shared their sites with historically protected structures, they were exempt from a variety of current local zoning laws: Their habitable spaces, for example, did not need to be raised above base flood elevation. Among the resulting benefits of these strategies was the possibility of recovering a lost, but habitable ground plane that took full advantage of its mediated associations to both the street and the buildings surrounding it. These primarily sectional interrelationships, played out at the intimate scale demanded by a limited site, posed serious challenges to articulated definitions of private and public space. In response, the buildings found inventive alternative ways to unfold vertically as a spiral of shifting single and double height spaces whose geometries controlled internal exposure and which were formally resolved at a variety of rooftop conditions. Most intriguingly, the proposals introduced the possibility of an interior block condition that harbored greater density than its periphery—thus pushing the envelope that defines a protected historic district. They opened the possibility of a parallel alternate world inhabiting the mid density block and occasionally finding points of tangency and intersection through new semi-public collective spaces. Significantly, they elaborated a language of mid-block residual open spaces—not only through resulting ground-level courtyards, but also through new semi-public spaces of surrounding rooftops. Allowing residents to see beyond the surrounding buildings, those new public spaces become a lyrical articulation of the city's narrow barrier island condition—floating between the waters of the Atlantic Ocean and Biscayne Bay.

Walter Faustlin imported the typology of the rear-of-lot garage apartment from a single-family residential context to an area of commercial/ hotel density and zoning. In so doing, he proposed a new building type for the commercial urban block – a free-standing, independent structure, physically tied to none of the existing buildings, and speaking a tectonic language all its own.

Other projects, such as the one proposed by Mark Marine, and Juliana Kirby, presented new commercial/ residential types for mid-block sites in the historic Deco District. Although their offerings (an SRO and a youth hostel, respectively) followed the basic urban guidelines of adjacent building footprints, they retained neither their plans nor their sections. The ground plane in both of these otherwise dissimilar projects was left largely open –even excavated to allow for below-grade parking— and the buildings anchored themselves to the mid-block landscape through sectional intersections with existing structures and underground spaces. Again, the proposals inevitably inverted the conventional sectional sequence of public and private use areas, providing belvederes that made the most of distant city and ocean views, while reaching to the sky for light in its most public spaces: Most significantly, however, the projects interpreted their mandate as the design of virtual bridges extending across property lines, and touching ground only intermittently while locating points of entry along the alley, the street and the entire depth of the block. These projects traversed a continuous interior landscape condition, transforming it from private to public space. Elevating their program elements several stories above existing surrounding rooftops, both presented eloquent expressions of the man-made barrier island landscape of Miami Beach, whose seemingly solid ground is only inches above water.

Overall, the student work responded to a unique condition of urban density that rent open the once-private topography of the mid-block. Occupied by seemingly floating objects, no longer anchored to city streets in traditional fashion, that landscape is host to a semi-public world of complex internal connections regulated by their constricted sites and often ambitious programs. Representing their condition as signifiers of the multiple identities hidden beyond their front facades, such typological explorations have the power to bring harbingers of a new, compelling public realm to what was once a largely lost and private world.

"...THE INFERNO OF THE LIVING IS ...WHAT IS ALREADY HERE..., WHAT WE FORM BY LIVING TOGETHER. THE ARE TWO WAYS TO ESCAPE SUFFERING IT. THE FIRST IS EASY FOR MANY: ACCEPT THE INFERNO AND BECOME SUCH A PART OF IT THAT YOU CAN NO LONGER SEE IT. THE SECOND IS RISKY AND DEMANDS CONSTANT VIGILANCE AND APPREHENSION: SEEK TO RECOGNIZE WHO AND WHAT, IN THE MIDST OF THE INFERNO, IS NOT INFERNO, THEN MAKE THEM ENDURE, GIVE THEM SPACE."

– Italo Calvino, Invisible Cities
"Hidden Cities 5/The Great Khan"[25]

STUDENT PROJECT CREDITS:
Jorge Bernal, Valeria Bettoli, Alejandro Cuevas, Walter Faustlin, Malcom Giblin, Juliana Kirby, Mark Marine, Daniel Romero, Angel Suarez, Eleonora Vasiliadis.

NOTES:

1 Emily Dickinson, "To fill a Gap" quoted in Helen McNeil, *Emily Dickinson*, (London, New York, Virago/ Pantheon Pioneers Press, 1986.), 179.

2 From the *Call For Papers: Between First and Third Worlds*, 1999 ACSA South East Regional Conference.

3 Ibid

4 See Michael Sorkin, editor *Variations on a Theme Park: the new American city and the endo of Public Space*, (New York, Hill and Wang, 1992) for a series of discussions by various authors regarding the difficulties of historic preservation and attendant gentrification in an urban context. Especially, see M. Christine Boyer "Cities for Sale: merchandising history at South Street Seaport".

5 Allan Shulman, "Lincoln Road Alley Study". Submitted to the City of Miami Beach Joint Historic Preservation/ Design Review Board. Unpublished.

6 The Miami Beach historic district (and areas presently being submitted for historic district status) were built in a series of develop-

ment waves between 1920 and the late 1950's. Its history is well documented in numerous publications, most notably: Britt, L. S., *My Gold Coast;* Dade County Office of Economic Development, *From Wilderness to Metropolis*; Dunlop, Beth, *Miami's Vanishing Architecture*; and Gleason, *Miami: The Way We Were.*

[7] Alex Krieger, "The American City: Ideal and Mythic Aspects of a Reinvented Urbanism" in *Assemblage 3*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press, 1987), 41.

[8] See Mario Gandelsonas, "The Identity of the American City" in *X-Urbanism*, (New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1999) for a discussion of patterns for planning and transformation in the American city.

[9] See also Rem Koolhaas and Bruce Mau, *S,M,L,XL* for a discussion of the (American) Generic City, "held together by the *residual*", (New York, The Monacelli Press, 1998),1248 - 1264.

[10] Alex Kreiger, "The American City", p. 55.

[11] Jean Paul Sartre, "American Cities" in *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, Hutchinson Publishing Company, London, 1955 quoted in Alex Krieger, "The American City" p. 47.

[12] Ibid, p.43

[13] See John W. Reps, *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the Unites States*, (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1965) for a discussion of early planning strategies and urban patterns in the developing United States, tracing their European origins and noting their innovations. See also, A. Krieger, "The American City", p. 51.

[14] See, generally, Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" (1893) in *The Frontier in American History*, (New York, Holt, 1920), 1-38.

[15] See Mike Wallace, *Mickey Mouse History and Other Essays on American Memory*, (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1996) for a discussion of America's reluctantly developing acceptance of a preservationist mindset.

[16] Alex Kreiger, "The American City", p.43

[17] See K. Michael Hays in "Introduction" *Reflections on Architectural Practices in the Nineties*, William S. Saunders, editor, (New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1996),124-128 for a brief synopsis of architectural theory in the past half century.

[18] See, generally, Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter, *Collage City*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, MIT Press, 1975), 125-149 for a discussion of the uses of collage as an architectural design approach in which "objects are conscripted or seduced from out of their context."

[19] See also Antonio Monestiroli, "A Project By Others," in *Lotus 7: Quarterly Architectural Review*, (New York City, Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1992), 108 - 111. Monestiroli makes an argument for collage, differently defined, as the ideal means of understanding and organizing projects with multiple architects in a complex context. He posits collage as a stimulant to interpretation, simultaneously "...guaranteeing the unity of the result and the multiplicity of the choices."

[20] See K. Michael Hayes, *Unprecedented Realism: The Architecture of Machado and Silvetti*, (Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton Architectural Press, 1995), 14.

[21] See Rodolphe el-Khoury, "Paradoxical Seams" in *Ibid*, pp. 92 - 103, for a discussion of montage as a design strategy.

[22] See Steven Holl, *Hybrid Buildings, Pamphlet Architecture No. 11*, (New York, San Francisco, 1985) for a discussion of the origin and development of hybrid buildings in the American urban landscape as a response to issues of escalating density and land value within a fixed urban grid and the increasingly complex programmatic needs of buildings in the contemporary city.

[23] Allan Shulman, "Lincoln Road Alley Study". Submitted to the City of Miami Beach Joint Historic Preservation/ Design Review Board.

[24] See Monica Ponce de Leon and Nader Tehrani for an example of a study of infrastructure reinterpreted to enhance urban public space in Miami, Florida. In "The Road 836 Overpass in Miami", Jean-Francois LeJeune, editor, *The New City No. 3: Modern Cities, Journal of the University of Miami School of Architecture*, (New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 178 -183.

[25] Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, translated by William Weaver, (New York, , London, San Diego, Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1972), 10 - 11.