

Exploding the Urban Block: Residual Urban Space in the Alleys of the Art Deco Historic District, Miami Beach, Florida

MARILYS R. NEPOMECHIE
Florida International University

...Such inner peace as men gain must represent a tension among contradictions and uncertainties...A feeling for paradox allows seemingly dissimilar things to exist side by side, their very incongruity suggesting a kind of truth. (1)

A desire to test the elastic limits of preservation as urban strategy lies at the heart of the following essay. The widely publicized image of the City of Miami Beach—as reinforced by its historic preservation guidelines and public review processes—has, over the past 15 years, resulted in a predictable amalgam of nostalgia and gentrification. By testing the development potential of residual, interstitial spaces along the service alleys that define the interior of the urban block in the Deco District, students in a 1999 senior undergraduate design studio at Florida International University questioned both the image of the gentrified historic district and the process that produced it. Guided by a critic who sits on the city's Historic Preservation/ Design Review Board, students suggested 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”(2) inherent in the transformation of protected historic urban fabrics over time, specifically as a result of prevailing development strategies that concurrently press for increased intensity of use and gentrification—while blithely ignoring its social and physical costs. 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, an early twentieth century historic district, prized and protected primarily as artifact/ commodity, and is set against the aggressively marketed city of the late twentieth century that simultaneously threatens and depends upon the success of preservation efforts. On the other hand stand the invariably neglected physical facts of a parallel, gritty, urban netherworld of critical need—one inhabited by a disenfranchised indigent population increasingly alienated by the gentrified city and silently occupying the forgotten spaces that straddle history and invention.

The studio adopted a critical stance toward competing issues of development and preservation, proposing not simply to fill empty lots in the historic district with the new, thematically correct construction often favored by the city Design Review Boards, but rather

to investigate the shadow networks of the existing city (3)—its mid-block alley infrastructure and residual spaces—as the potential locus of an alternative urbanism (4). Here, the studio posited, in the uncharted territory between the historically protected and the carefully “contextual”, a largely independent, darkly private “back door” world (5) might find a 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 new architectural programs proposed for the re(dis)covered interstitial spaces that were defined by the studio as the “silent alter ego” of Miami Beach. (6) (7)

The student work, contemplating a series of interventions in an early twentieth century historic district (8), served as an ideal vehicle to explore aspects of the American urban condition. The proposals for territory accruing to the service alleys of the 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 current planning and zoning practices—as well as by the physical and social changes that have taken place within the city over the past 80 years. The projects, proposing a series of complex initiatives that blurred distinctions between public responsibility and private interests, looked to a broad range of systems of superposition ranging from the casbah to ‘complexity theory’ (9) while mirroring the intricacies of the contemporary city and proposing an architecture of what Robert Venturi termed not ‘either-or’, but ‘both-and’.(10)

A CHANGING AMERICAN CITY STRUCTURE

Enumerating the distinctive characteristics of a uniquely American urbanism, Alex Kreiger has noted that throughout the nineteenth century, while traditional European 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.”(11) 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 European predecessor.(12) 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 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 which 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 the grid.(13)(14) 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.(15) 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, 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.(16)

In the American city, the relationship of the urban grid to the individual lot has offered possibilities for responding to development pressures 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 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.” (17) Historically, and, some would argue, as a matter of principle (18), 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.(19) Perhaps because it has placed greater hope on the as-yet-unknown possibilities of its future, the American city has repeatedly devalued itself as artifact and thus, rising legions of historic preservationists might argue, its own past.(20)

By contrast, the European city 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.(21) 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 this senior undergraduate design studio, is an argument for interventions in contemporary American cities that refrain from demanding massive alteration of their context in order to establish urban intentions. A strong local preservation ethos places a clear premium upon the maintenance of the existing fabric in Miami Beach. It 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: The studio explores the possibility of reinterpreting aspects of a European urban “fabric” strategy, to fit a contemporary American city that increases in density while eschewing figural space. Leveling a measure of criticism at master narratives of American urban development, the studio proposes that American cities might look to European models for a mechanism that registers evolution without destruction. Student projects suggest 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 respond 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.”(22)(23) It looked to *collage/ montage* in order to generate “an alternative reality, a critique of reality”.(24) In the junctures between its incompatible parts, in the “by-product of the technique” of assembly, lies the identity of *collage/ montage*. Rupturing the Modernist unity between form and content, *collage* makes multiple meanings possible (25) through “the confrontation of autonomous fragments [that] contrast ancient and new structures... finding the ground and the form in which past and present recognize each other”.(26) Working in a unique physical context, the studio sought to engage Venturi’s “both-and”, the “oscillating relationships, complex and contradictory, [which] are the source of the ambiguity and tension characteristic to the medium of architecture.”(27)

The Miami Beach projects draw 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 incorporate the ghosts and echoes of its disenfranchised inhabitants even as it lays a groundwork for the future of the city. The projects provide examples of intermediate scale interventions that respect aspects of the historically protected district, contemplate complex composite buildings, recover lost spaces

in the city, and engage existing structures by proposing strong sectional relationships to context.(28) In so doing, they successfully mitigate disparities between the collective fabric and the individual building, between the urban scale and the scale of the single structure, between historic artifact and contemporary development. Moreover, by making proposals that, cutting across boundaries of privilege, hoped to embody the histories and collective experiences of a place, the projects speak to the challenges posed by residual urban spaces to traditional meanings of public,0 community and citizen.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN 8

The alleys of the Miami Beach Art Deco District are a shadow network to the avenues and boulevards that traditionally define the city. They are largely undeveloped places of remarkable aesthetics, typically invisible to most passers-by and secondary to the buildings they serve. (29) 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.(30) In parts of the Beach, these north-south alleys have recently also become home to 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, their survival suggests that the neglected residual spaces that collect along these 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, may provide a key to the evolution of a critical —and alternative—urbanism, discovered in conversation with an existing context that is privileged as artifact, by virtue of its historic designation.

The students undertook a series of independently structured design projects sited along and within these alleys, plumbing the range of possible relationships between alley and street. Iconographically specific instances of a broader argument for interventions in the city that work sectionally within the historic urban fabric to enhance it, the projects were completely bound up in exhaustive readings of the site (31), explicitly recognizing the complex intricacies 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 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 within which that new development might take place.

Students were challenged to understand the morphology of the *interior* of the urban block —in an historic district largely defined by the picturesque character of its periphery: 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 buildings that define the streets of the city (said streets understood as the recognizable entities that 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? Infrastructure and public space?

Through individually directed investigations, students tested the viability of a broad assortment of project references, including: the rear-of-lot residential alley structure, the parasite building, the infill structure, the casbah, the additive structure and the hybrid building. They also investigated a range of viable building programs: The (automobile) storage building, the youth hostel, the SRO, the eatery, the nightclub, the tattoo parlor, the 24-hour copy place, the hidden garden, the office structure, the residential high rise. Their work demanded that they understand the parameters that defined the Art Deco Historic District in order to push the envelope of that definition.

Although the studio focused on built and unbuilt space conditions along the alleys of two specific 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 subsequent explorations. These, in turn, drew upon existing zoning regulations, the possible range of property ownership/ development arrangements recognized by the City of Miami Beach, the viability of leasing/ purchasing air rights form public and private entities for construction, and the legal means for re-assembling portions of already platted properties. In addition to exhaustive photographic records of the site, students produced measured drawings of existing conditions and highly detailed, 3/16" models of the two city blocks (including power poles, fences and the occasional tree).

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 longer 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 officially accessible only by means of their 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 view corridors allow occasional glimpses of the Ocean and Bay from the inner world of the alley.

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 the 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 although this type of development had never been proposed in the past, considerable vertical construction was nevertheless 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. Finally, students discovered that the mechanisms for assembling property in unconventional ways appeared to be negotiable at larger scales of development.(32)

In response, the buildings developed in the studio 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. Each of the projects stretched the boundaries of 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's fourteen students produced a remarkable range of solutions to the problems of development in the 'fourth wall'. Students were encouraged to work intimately with the unique physical

conditions and adjacencies of their chosen sites, using them as both landscape and infrastructure: as points of access, as vertical circulation, as structural support. In all cases, students remarked that their projects were impossible to read as independent objects, and ultimately incomprehensible without the context models to which their proposals accrued.

Among a series of examples, *Eleonora Vasiliadis* proposed a youth hostel for one of the city blocks under study. A long, low, sinuous parasite building that grafted itself onto existing historic and non-contributing structures in the alley, her project suggested the inhabitation of alley air space, allowing clear passage for pedestrian and vehicular traffic below. The structure extended (and borrowed use of) the existing exterior stairs and horizontal catwalks of neighboring structures for access, while allowing for the public inhabitation of neighboring rooftops. Invisible from either primary or secondary street and transforming the alley beneath it, the solution developed from an intensive three-dimensional excavation of the project site that allowed her to interpret the *ad hoc* character of existing construction in the alley. Building in steel and wood where her neighbors built in concrete and masonry, appearing fragile and temporary where existing buildings reveled in solidity and permanence, her project questioned the relationship between old and new structures, between old and new constituencies of inhabitation, and suggested a contrasting tectonic language to respond to the uniqueness of that condition.

Similarly interested in disappearing into the interstices between existing buildings and evoking the precarious impermanence of street existence, *Jorge Bernal* proposed a soup kitchen and a series of homeless shelters for discovered, episodically occurring narrow gaps between existing protected structures. Rejected outright by most of the class as too restrictive to be buildable (the spaces had a minimum width of 5'-0" and a maximum width of 10'-0"), these spaces provided an opportunity to give a tactile dimension to absence. His proposals, twisting and bending vertically for light, occupying spaces high enough above grade to allow existing building services to continue uninterrupted, and supporting themselves by new structural elements grafted upon existing bearing walls, comprised a carefully engineered kit of parts expected to be erected quickly, dismantled at will, and re-configured in spaces similarly discarded as unusable, for a growing population of urban nomads.

In contrast, *Malcom Giblin* and *Daniel Romero* offered solutions that defied height and density zoning restrictions outright. These students stacked sizable residential and commercial program behind existing historic structures, and granted broad public access to the alley. Their proposals introduced the possibility of interior block conditions that harbored far greater density and operated at a far larger scale, than their protected periphery. They demanded a re-evaluation of the definition of a historic district, arguing that contemporary development pressures would render them little more than picturesque facades to the more prominent construction behind them. Significantly, the projects elaborated a language of mid-block development that challenged Kevin Lynch's argument for "lost" city spaces, elevating a new group of alley residents above the urban wall formed by the historic building periphery to

gain visual access to the Ocean and Bay beyond. In contrast to the historic pattern of back-alley residential construction across the United States and in parts of Europe (33), these projects effectively inverted the urban patterns and socio economic hierarchy of front and rear of lot.

Other projects, such as the ones proposed by *Mark Marine* and *Juliana Kirby*, presented new commercial/residential types for mid-block sites in the historic Deco District. 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. Their offerings (an SRO and a youth hostel, respectively) interpreted their mandates as a charge to design bridges that extended across property lines, and touched ground only intermittently while locating points of entry along the alley, the street and the entire depth of the block. Elevating their program elements several stories above existing surrounding rooftops, both projects 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 buildings no longer anchored to city streets in traditional fashion, that landscape became host to a semi-public world of complex internal connections regulated by their constricted sites and ambitious programs. Signifiers of the multiple identities hidden beyond their front facades, these explorations suggest a new, compelling public realm in what was once a semi-private world defined by city infrastructure (34). The projects challenged the conventional definition of preservation, seeking to replace stewardship-of-the-picturesque/nostalgic-for-profit with a sense of historical consciousness that nevertheless allowed for (sometimes tremendous) change. They sought to respond to the needs of the diverse urban community whose current presence in these alleys is anathema to the gentrification that invariably follows successful historic preservation efforts. Their investigation of residual, interstitial spaces along the service alleys that define the interior of the block in the Art Deco District found spaces of untapped potential, whose current condition of gritty, critical need, holds one possible key to the development and reinterpretation of the city.

“...*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” (35)

STUDIO CREDITS

Critic:	Marilyn R. Nepomechie, AIA, NCARB
Studio:	Architectural Design 8, Florida International University, Spring 1999.
Students:	Otto Barrotto, Jorge Bernal, Valeria Bettoli, Alejandro Cuevas, Walter Faustin, Malcom Giblin, Juliana Kirby, Mark Marine, Rafael Pannizza, Daniel Romero, Brian Saponaro, Angel Suarez, Eleonora Vasiliadis, Johannes Welch

NOTES

- ¹August Heckscher, *The Public Happiness*, (New York, Atheneum Publishers, 1962), 102. Quoted in Venturi, Robert, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, (New York, The Museum of Modern Art Papers on Architecture in Association with the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in Fine Arts, Chicago, 1977), 16.
- ²Rigau, Jorge, *From the Call For Papers: Between First and Third Worlds*, 1999 ACSA South East Regional Conference.
- ³Ellen Beaseley, *The Alleys and Back Buildings of Galveston: An architectural and social history*, (Houston, Rice University Press, 1996).
- ⁴See Michael Sorkin, editor *Variations on a Theme Park: the new American city and the end 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”.
- ⁵Allan Shulman, “Lincoln Road Alley Study”. Unpublished manuscript submitted to the City of Miami Beach Joint Historic Preservation/ Design Review Board in support of alley construction proposals, 1999.
- ⁶For an illuminating discussion of alley dwellings and the establishment of urban African American communities in the 19th and 20th centuries, see Borchert, James, *Alley Life in Washington: Family, Community, Religion and Folklife in the City, 1850 – 1970*. (Urbana/ Chicago/ London, University of Illinois Press, 1980). Borchert describes Washington DC alley dwellings, as well as those Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and those of various cities throughout England, Germany and Egypt. His general bibliography of alley dwellings is an invaluable resource.
- ⁷See Ignasi de Sola-Morales Rubio, “From Contrast to Analogy: Developments in the Concept of Architectural Intervention” in *Lotus International No. 46*. (Venice, Milan, Rizzoli International Press, 1985) pp 37-45, for an illuminating discussion of the limitations of a collage strategy in developing relationships between new and existing architecture. In so far as the studio focus on collage is what Sola-Morales considers ‘optimistic’, it is based on an interest in the city as artifact, as what Aldo Rossi terms “the collective memory of man.” *The Architecture of the City* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, Oppositions Books, MIT Press, 1986).
- ⁸The Miami Beach historic district (and areas presently being submitted for historic district classification) were built in a series of development 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*. Gleason, *Miami: The Way We Were* and Hatton, Hap, *Tropical Splendor: An architectural history of Florida*, among others. The Miami Design Preservation League, based in Miami Beach, has extensive archives documenting that development.
- ⁹See Charles Jenks, *The Architecture of the Jumping Universe* (London, Academy Editions, 1997) “Superposition: Can One Build In Time” for a discussion of the production of the post-Modern landscape.
- ¹⁰Robert Venturi’s well-known argument in favor of the difficult whole was particularly relevant to our study of the complexity arising from neces-

- sary accommodation in an evolving historic context. See *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, (New York, The Museum of Modern Art Papers on Architecture in Association with the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in Fine Arts, Chicago, 1977), 16.
- ¹¹Alex Krieger, "The American City: Ideal and Mythic Aspects of a Reinvented Urbanism" in *Assemblage 3*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press, 1987), 41.
- ¹²See 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.
- ¹³See 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.
- ¹⁴Alex Kreiger, "The American City", p. 55.
- ¹⁵Jean Paul Sartre, "American Cities" in *Literary and Philosophical Essays*. Hutchinson Publishing Company. London, 1955 quoted in Alex Krieger, "The American City" p. 47.
- ¹⁶Ibid, p.43
- ¹⁷See John W. Reys, *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United 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.
- ¹⁸See, 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.
- ¹⁹See 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.
- ²⁰Alex Kreiger, "The American City", p.43
- ²¹See 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 synopsis of architectural theory in the past half century.
- ²²See, 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."
- ²³See 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."
- ²⁴See K. Michael Hayes, *Unprecedented Realism: The Architecture of Machado and Silvetti*, (Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton Architectural Press, 1995), 14.
- ²⁵See Rodolphe el-Khoury, "Paradoxical Seams" in *Ibid*, pp. 92 - 103, for a discussion of montage as a design strategy.
- ²⁶Ignasi de Sola-Morales Rubio, "From Contrast to Analogy: Developments in the Concept of Architectural Intervention" in *Lotus International No. 46*. (Venice, Milan, Rizzoli International Press, 1985) pp 37-45. Sola-Morales looks to Giorgio Grassi's critique of Viollet-le-Duc, advocating instead the use of historical architecture as "*analogical* marks of the new construction" (italics in the original).
- ²⁷Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, 16, 20.
- ²⁸See 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 1- escalating density and land value within a fixed urban grid and 2- the increasingly complex programmatic needs of buildings in the contemporary city.
- ²⁹See Kevin Lynch, *The Image of the City*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, The MIT Press, 1960) for an important discussion of "lost" spaces in our cities, rendered invisible to both residents and visitors by a complex array of physical and social causes.
- ³⁰Allan Shulman, "Lincoln Road Alley Study". Unpublished manuscript, submitted to the City of Miami Beach Joint Historic Preservation/ Design Review Board in support of construction within the city's alley structure.
- ³¹Ignasi de Sola-Morales Rubio, p.38.
- ³²The information described in this section was gathered by students from the City of Miami Beach Planning and Zoning Code and Bylaws, and discussed and interpreted in conversations between students and members of the City Planning and Zoning Department and Architectural Design Review staff.
- ³³Kevin Lynch, *The Image of the City*, 20.
- ³⁴See 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.
- ³⁵Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, translated by William Weaver, (New York, London, San Diego, Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1972), 10 - 11.