

SOCIAL NETWORKS IN INNER-CITY APARTMENT COMPLEXES AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE OF PUBLIC SPACE

Marcus Foth

*Creative Industries Research and Applications Centre and Australasian CRC for Interaction Design
Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, Australia
m.foth@qut.edu.au*

Paul Sanders

*School of Design, Faculty of Built Environment and Engineering
Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, Australia
ps.sanders@qut.edu.au*

ABSTRACT

The development of more and more compact cities draws critical attention to the design and architecture of apartment buildings and their role as elemental components of urban renewal. At the same time, new media and information and communication technologies afford networked individualism and emerging social formations that require a re-conceptualisation of the online vs. offline dichotomy. Public space is becoming a complex hybrid in which members of what Watters calls 'urban tribes' traverse seamlessly between cyberspace and physical space. This paper introduces an Australian case study of residents in three inner-city apartment complexes. Observations and interview results are used to illustrate the interaction between residents and public space, their friends, and their neighbours. The discussion of these findings highlights that there are unfulfilled promises and unmet challenges in the design and architecture of both virtual and physical public space to support the communication and interaction needs of urban dwellers. We suggest three areas of engagement: serendipitous encounters between residents, sociocultural animation of neighbourhoods, and digital augmentation of public space.

KEYWORDS

social networks; residential architecture; public space; networked individualism; urban renewal; digital augmentation

1. INTRODUCTION

After the home and the workplace, public spaces are the most prominent building blocks of a city. They act as 'social catalysts', places where urban residents and members of neighbourhood communities meet to create and maintain social ties and friendships and engage in discussion and debate. They are paramount in establishing the identity and culture of a city and a sense of cohesion and belonging.

The emergence and uptake of new media and networked information and communication technologies have added a range of new public spaces that provide opportunities for city dwellers to meet online, e.g., in chat rooms, discussion forums, community networks, and massive multi-user online games, as well as peer-to-peer through email, instant messengers and SMS (short message service). Early pessimistic voices interpreted these forms of interaction as alarming expressions of increasing 'individualism' and 'privatisation of leisure time' that provide evidence for the disappearance of traditional forms of civic engagement and community values and for a strong decline of social capital in society (Putnam, 2000).

However, online participation in public spaces can facilitate new connections to work, education, civic participation and a healthy social fabric. Watters rightly argues that

social capital comes from much more fluid and informal (yet potentially quite close and intricate) connections between people. [...], social capital could as easily accrue among a tight group of friends yet still have an effect on the community at large. (Watters, 2003, p. 116)

The internet and mobile phones provide means for city residents to connect with each other and to negotiate face-to-face meetings and social gatherings that take place somewhere in the city. Hence, physical place is increasingly important not despite but because of the range of social ties, bridging links and local interactions that occur online (Fallows, 2004; Horrigan, 2001), an effect that Hampton and Wellman call 'glocalization' (Wellman, 2002). These connections are created and maintained in both virtual and physical public spaces and urban residents traverse these worlds seamlessly as they are increasingly interwoven. Thus, it is time to depart from simple binary oppositions and compartmentalised dichotomies such as 'physical place' vs. 'cyberspace' or 'online' vs. 'offline' (DiMaggio *et al.*, 2001; Lovink, 2005) and embrace the complex hybrid nature of public space.

The role that urban neighbourhoods play in this new era has changed. The premise that a strong place will ensure a strong community needs to be revisited. Previously, neighbourhoods were marked by central public places that provided traditional meeting spots such as the market place or town square. These locations were used to meet with friends and peers. Mobile communications technology such as the mobile phone and SMS, and ubiquitous communications technology which can be accessed anywhere, such as wireless local area networks, are now enabling users to negotiate meeting places and venues on-the-fly anywhere and anytime.

Studying urban public space requires a cross-disciplinary approach with contributions from three main areas, that is, the people dimension (urban sociology, community development, communication studies), the place dimension (urban design, town planning, architecture), and the technology dimension (community informatics, interaction design, computer science). So far, much interest has focused on how new technologies enable new forms of public space that digitally augment city life and lead to so-called 'digital cities', and how these spaces are designed, developed, maintained, used and administered effectively as well as what impact they have on the life of city residents. Surprisingly, the reverse direction, that is, the impact of new technologies that facilitate social networks and peer-to-peer interaction on the design and architecture of physical public space, has not been met with the level of attention necessary to invoke a truly cross-disciplinary exchange that goes both ways.

The impact of new technologies on residential architecture can be divided into three areas:

1. New technologies enable innovation in production and construction. New materials and construction processes allow architects to design buildings that realise unique forms and shapes that had been impossible before. Prominent building works by Frank Gehry, Norman Foster and others are examples of this.
2. New technologies are being implemented into buildings in a range of styles. The integration of universal ducts and wires to 'future-proof' the home and to provide local area connectivity, especially in master-planned community sites, is becoming a standard in new buildings, alongside electricity, gas and water. On the other end of the scale, interactive artistic experiments such as the Aegis Hyposurface (dECOi Architects, Paris, & RMIT, Melbourne) provide an artistic outlook of what the future of digital augmentation and integration may hold.
3. New technologies are being used by urban residents for personalised networking to form social formations that are different from conventional images of 'community', 'neighbourhood' and 'urban village'. Their use of new technology enables a fluid, swarming social behaviour that has implications on residential architecture and the design of public space.

This paper is about the latter point, the new social formations as they emerge in three inner-city apartment buildings in Australia and the implications for the residential architecture of the public spaces in those buildings. We briefly outline the relevance and significance of this topic that is established two-fold by (a) an ongoing trend towards more and more compact cities in the light of urban renewal, and (b) findings from urban sociology that describe the emergence of networked individualism. These two notions are now discussed in turn.

2. URBAN RENEWAL IN AN AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT

Australia is one of the most urbanised countries in the world in terms of the high proportion of urban dwellers among its total population. Approximately two-thirds of the total population reside in major cities (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2004). In South East Queensland (SEQ), a region of approximately 75 km radius around the City of Brisbane, rapid urban growth has been projected over the next twenty years. The management of this growth has been the subject of a strategic regional plan, developed under the auspices of the Office of Urban Management of the Queensland Government. This document provides some statistical data as the backdrop rationale for urban renewal in SEQ towards higher densification of inner-city areas.

SEQ has experienced high and sustained population growth since the 1980s, growing at an average of 55,000 persons each year between 1986 and 2003. The estimated resident population of the region in 2004 is 2,654,000. Current projections for the region are 3,709,000 by 2026, an increase of around 1.05 million people, or almost 50,000 each year on average.

The projected population increase, combined with the continuing trend towards smaller households, will require an estimated 550,000 new dwellings to be constructed in the region between 2004 and 2026. There will also be a greater demand for a diversity of housing forms to match the needs of changing household structures, particularly an increase in one and two person households across all adult ages. (Queensland Government, 2004, p. 6)

The Queensland Government as well as local government representatives are aware that the continuation of the low density urban sprawl in the SEQ region is not sustainable. A range of implications have been proposed in the Regional Plan such as the implementation of policies to ensure that new developments are contained within the existing urban footprint of the region, protecting areas of urban landscape and rural production, and delivering more compact and higher density residential solutions. A further complexion relating to residential trends that have been identified here is the proliferation of large detached dwellings on small lots. Statistics indicate that family sizes in these large homes is decreasing with a tendency to single and couple occupancies and a related strong demand for one and two bedroom units.

At the same time recent economic trends in Australia have seen a rapid escalation in real estate value to a point where entry level residential accommodation in inner-city areas is becoming unattainable for the average income earner. More and more households with limited resources are excluded from high amenity areas in the inner city and gravitate to areas offering relatively low housing costs in city fringes and new greenfield estates (Healy & Birrell, 2004). Issues of affordability and density in residential accommodation further impact on strategies for urban zoning as well as future typologies in the design and delivery of adequate residential stock.

These trends that are similar in other urban and residential areas elsewhere in the world have global economic relevance and reflect a changing role of cities internationally. In Australia, compact city policies are being developed and implemented in all capitals to deal with population pressures and urban expansion. In the 'Network Society' (Castells, 2000, 2004), the strategies proposed in these policy documents open up new research questions around issues of governance and sustainability (Gleeson et al., 2004). They require a re-interpretation of what archetypical concepts, such as 'neighbourhood community', 'urban village', 'smart growth' and 'new urbanism' (De Villiers, 1997; Walmsley, 2000), mean in practice. Randolph rightly argues that

the language of community has come back with vengeance in policy areas that ignored it for many years. Cities are becoming, perhaps more than ever before, collections of distinctive communities and neighbourhoods, all the more differentiated as the cities grow in size and complexity. As the city expands, people remain focused on their small part of it. (Randolph, 2004, p. 483)

Mixed-use residential apartment complexes are 'a small part of it', yet arguably one of the most prominent components of urban densification and thus play a crucial role in urban renewal. Apartment buildings provide the immediate surroundings in which location-based interactions with other residents could occur and communicative ecologies and social networks could emerge. However, their architectural design

and layout (beyond issues of market demand, scope and scale) is rarely informed by societal developments and sociological insights and has hitherto been guided more by the functional requirements of the individual resident and by rental and investment returns than by the resident community at large and their need for public space and interaction. These conditions are being aggravated by prevailing attitudes of developers who confuse 'planning for community' with 'master-planning community' (Gleeson, 2004; Ziller, 2004).

There are few exceptions. In Brisbane, the architectural practice of Donovan Hill acknowledges the essential commodity of public space in the pursuit of sustainable environments in residential design. Private residences are construed as fragments of cities, the design for the components of the houses are set around a plaza or courtyard, a focal public place within a private realm. Not surprisingly, Donovan Hill's designs for multi-unit developments embrace this theme of public place. Their design for an eight townhouse development in Terrace Street, New Farm, establishes a large lawn space as common garden, from which all units relate.

The context of urban renewal in SEQ as outlined suggests that innovative models of housing will need to be considered in addressing the impending pressures on the availability of residential accommodation. Solutions that yield higher densities will be sought, and opportunities to inform residential architecture through advanced understandings of social networks and communicative ecologies will be essential in order to create public space that accommodates the needs of urban residents and their new social formations.

3. NEW SOCIAL FORMATIONS IN THE NETWORK SOCIETY

Since the advent of modern means of transportation and global communication, the importance of door-to-door and place-to-place neighbourhood ties, which (apart from family and kinship ties) used to provide the closest and most convenient way to socialise, has been diminished by friends and peers other than neighbours who fulfill social needs in various person-to-person and role-to-role relationships (Wellman, 2001). The portfolio of sociability (Castells, 2001) of urban residents, that is, the result of maintaining a range of individual social ties with selected friends through the internet, mobile phones and other media, tend to be place-independent. Nevertheless, the frequency of contact with the nodes in our portfolio is mostly dependent on the nodes' proximity to our locality. We remain what Baker & Ward (2002, p. 221) describe as "physically-instantiated and geographically-centred individuals and citizens".

The hybrid nature of maintaining a portfolio of sociability that is at the same time both 'individualistic' in the sense of social control and private ownership, and 'networked' in the sense of being connected to a personalised set of friends and peers has led to the term 'networked individualism' (Wellman, 2002). Waters' (2003) detailed description of 'urban tribes' illustrates how the theoretical concept of networked individualism applies in practice in an urban context.

Networked individualism introduces challenges to conventional understandings of 'place' and 'public places'. It opens up opportunities for architecture, city planning and urban studies to re-conceptualise their understanding of community and neighbourhood planning in the light of opportunities presented by new media and network ICTs (cf. Castells, 2004; Florida, 2003; Graham, 2004; Mitchell, 2003; Oldenburg, 2001; Walmsley, 2000). The contemporary interpretation of community is shifting from 'village' and 'neighbourhood' to 'social network' and 'urban tribe'. However, such a re-conceptualisation has not been achieved yet in all relevant areas due to a lack of theoretical and practical understandings of the freedom and constraints and the social and cultural meanings that urban dwellers derive from their use of location-based ICTs.

Neighbourhood identity and a sense of belonging is derived less and less from the bricks and mortar of the built environment itself and more and more from a combination of the usage of the built environment – especially the 'third place' (Oldenburg, 2001), such as cafés, bars, parks, etc. – and the transitory meaning residents associate with these places. It could be any decent café that a group of friends decide to meet at. The decision to use this particular café as today's meeting place bestows meaning on this place – yet, tomorrow, it could be the café across the street, as long as it is conveniently located within the proximity of group members. The agora of the group's interaction can be quite motile but remains essentially face-to-face and place-based, either within the neighbourhood, suburb or city. ICT plays a role in preparing the meeting, and possibly during or after the meeting to prepare the next gathering.

New light has recently been shed at the location preferences and decisions of citizens in the context of diversity and creativity (Florida, 2003). Early results indicate that people prefer to settle in open, accepting and permeable cities. That said, an online community network (Day, 2002) might contribute to a city's permeability by affording personalised networking and by offering a choice of residents to socialise with on the basis of self-selected criteria such as age, interest, family status, profession, nationality, etc. However, the new emerging social formations and communicative ecologies which are at the same time networked and individualistic have implications not only for systems architecture of online public space but also for the residential architecture of physical public space.

4. PUBLIC SPACE IN RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDINGS

One of the significant common denominators in well functioning residential architecture is the provision of social spaces, interstitial places that offer opportunities for interaction, and exchange. The cloistered monastical courtyards provided inhabitants with a public place of relief from the humble quarters of the private cells. In another context the Public Houses marking the street corners of nineteenth century British mass terraced housing provided the scale of lounge environment for social gatherings spaces, as private living rooms were modest and inadequately sized for group interaction. In the mass housing solutions of the twentieth century, the street was replaced by the access corridor in high-rise developments, mostly void of places to dwell, providing mere circulation. As these corridors became devices of internalised access, the mounting disfunctionality increased in the face of developers' slim profit margins.

The modernist residential tower blocks mostly failed to recognise the model established in Le Corbusier's Unité d'Habitation in Marseilles, France, completed in 1952, that of an elevated podium (allowing the landscaping to flow beneath the structure), the allocation of public amenities on mid block floors (shops, laundry, etc.), and recreation facilities (pool, playground, crèches) on the roof. The need to optimise the return on real estate investment focuses the attention of today's developers of apartment buildings on the apartments themselves; for they are sold according to size and location. Public space may add value, but also increases body corporate fees and maintenance requirements. It is thus not surprising that public space in residential apartment complexes appears all too often to be an afterthought and a way to fill up gaps.

Case study of three inner-city apartment buildings

Our case study research comprises three different inner-city residential apartment complexes in metropolitan Australia. To protect the privacy of residents, the sites will be referred to as 'Alpha', 'Melba' and 'Sigma'. Research methods that have been employed are situated within an action research framework (Hearn & Foth, 2005) and include mostly qualitative and ethnographic methods such as surveys, focus groups, participant and site observation and interviews.

Research on Alpha has been running since late 2002. Melba and Sigma have been added to the case study at the end of 2004 to control for certain demographic factors and to enable a more comparative analysis. Opened in 2000, Alpha is an apartment complex for international students who are about 17 to 24 years of age and study at nearby tertiary institutions. They come from a variety of national and cultural backgrounds. The majority of tenants only stays short-term, that is, for one or two semesters of study. About a fifth of tenants come to Australia to study a full degree program which usually lasts three to four years. Alpha contains 94 one, two and three bedroom units with a total of approximately 160 tenants.

Melba was built in the mid Nineties and is the home of mostly working singles and couples in their Twenties and Thirties. It contains 39 two and three bedroom units with a total of approximately 90 residents, mostly tenants and some owner-occupiers. Length of residence at Melba is medium to long-term. Sigma is the largest site which was completed in the early Eighties. It consist of three high-rise buildings, a low-rise two story building and 48 townhouses. There are 156 apartments and approximately 300 residents in total with the majority being owner-occupiers and some tenants. Residents are mostly couples and families in their Forties and Fifties working in diverse occupations with some retirees. Length of residence at Sigma is usually long-term. Unlike Alpha where every tenant is an international student, there is no pre-existing underlying common link at Melba or Sigma other than living in the one complex.

Interaction Between Residents and Public Spaces

The public spaces at Alpha, Melba and Sigma are examples of contemporary residential architecture. In this study we are interested to analyse how the use of digital information and communication technologies and resulting social behaviour impacts on the purpose of public space and how it is used and seen by the residents of our case study sites. Each apartment or unit at all three sites includes one or more bathrooms and a kitchen, so there is no need for residents to leave their unit and use shared facilities which is common in shared accommodation and college-style dormitories and which could stimulate the initiation of interaction with neighbours.

Alpha consists of two six-storey buildings which are linked through a gateway on each level. There is a reception and lobby area on the ground floor, a laundry room and a common room with a pool table and ping-pong table on Level 1, an outdoor swimming pool on Level 3, as well as two barbecue sites. Melba consists of three three-storey apartment buildings that are built along the corner of two streets. Seven separate entrances give access to a cluster of about six apartments each. The only underlying link is the common underground car park through which all residents have to walk in order to get to the courtyard pool and barbecue area on the inside of the building. Sigma is a gated multi-building complex with its own private street system. There are a swimming and a lap pool at Sigma, a tennis court as well as a barbecue site. In relation to its size, public spaces at Sigma are sparse.

The number and size of public spaces also depend on the size and layout of the apartments themselves. The smaller an apartment is, the less social space it offers for entertainment and other purposes, especially in shared accommodation. Public spaces can make up for this lack by offering break-out areas. Collective ownership of public spaces also enables residents to access and use facilities which would be too large, too expensive or too inconvenient to maintain on their own such as pools, gyms or tennis courts.

A gym would be fantastic – none of the units are large enough to cater for basic gym equipment and the gyms nearby are quite expensive. (Resident at Melba)

I rarely use the shared facilities. (Resident at Melba)

Advantages: Don't have to maintain the public areas (more time on our hands). If feeling sociable there are generally people around. Security, there is always someone around. (Resident at Melba)

However, collective ownership does not mean collective use. Most public spaces are meant to be 'public' in relation to access, but 'private' in relation to use. Yet most of them do not offer the adequate level of privacy that residents desire. The barbecue area at Sigma as well as the combined outdoor pool/ barbecue area at Melba are surrounded by apartments and open to the gaze of spectators. The lack of privacy of these panoptic spaces make many residents feel uncomfortable and awkward.

More interesting space around [the] barbeque – more landscaping etc. Currently very open and not a terribly interesting place to bbq. Would love it to be a place you want to go, and enjoy eating a meal rather than feeling like everyone is watching you. (Resident at Sigma)

More privacy, most people can see what is going on. (Resident at Melba)

Public spaces also give residents the opportunity to invite a number of friends and visitors over who cannot be accommodated in the private space of an apartment. Thus, public spaces offer three distinct types of use: single use, collective/ shared use by residents, and individual use by residents with friends. Policies and rules may need to be in place to govern access and to allow residents to book a space for private use. However, it is difficult to negotiate priorities between exclusive use by individuals or groups since it depends on the social attitude of residents and group sizes.

I usually wait until the other residents have finished because that provides me with the privacy that I need. (Resident at Alpha)

Depends on the number of them, and again my mood. It is overwhelming at times meeting tons of new people. Though sometimes it is nice. Smaller groups are more approachable. (Resident at Alpha)

Depends on the groups, kids can deter me as they tend to be a little annoying, large groups deter me as I feel they would be better to have the space for themselves, I haven't been disappointed with any people, generally when I want to use the areas it is reasonably quiet. (Resident at Melba)

Depends on how many are there. More likely to wait until they have gone if it's busy. (Resident at Sigma)

Interaction Between Residents and Their Friends

One of Watter's (2003) findings about the social behaviour of urban tribes describes their apparent invisibility to external observers. Urban tribes, or similar social formations, do not appear as one coherent entity to the public. They are private networks that integrate seamlessly into the social fabric of urban life. Members of an urban tribe may not even be aware of their membership nor of the extent of the network. The interactions between the nodes of these social networks take place in both physical and virtual spaces. They traverse cyberspace (email, instant messengers, mobile phones) and the 'third' space (cafés, parks, bars) with ease. However, in any case, interaction usually remains private and peer-to-peer, whether it is mediated online or direct face-to-face interaction. Hence, the preferred social spaces of urban tribes are private spaces (someone's home) or private places in public spaces (cafés, bars, internet). Even if groups of friends meet up in a large public space such as a night club or discothèque do they form private clusters that gravitate towards each other through an invisible bond.

The design of public space needs to acknowledge and accommodate this behaviour. Yet, most public spaces are designed to cater more for a collective many-to-many than a private peer-to-peer form of interaction. Although the choice between private spaces and private places in public spaces depends on situational circumstances and personal choice, the public spaces of their apartment buildings are considered not to be desirable meeting places in any case for residents to meet and socialise with their friends and peers.

I meet my friends a lot and it is usually away from [Alpha] probably [in a nearby park] or in the city. I don't like socialising at anyone's house even if it is my own house. (Resident at Alpha)

I generally have more fun at home or at another person's home than at a café, pool etc. (Resident at Melba)

I am far away from my established group of friends who are back home [...]. I used to see them daily at University, in the halls etc. I am slowly making new friends here. My flatmates and I hang out with a few others we've met. Usually the meeting place has been a restaurant or other such location. (Resident at Alpha)

I meet people all over the place, home might be the stop before heading out, sometimes we stay at our place or head to our friends. In general there is no preference, but if we are home it is mostly in our unit not in the public areas. (Resident at Melba)

Interaction Amongst Residents

Although it is easier than ever before to communicate and interact with others, forms of urban alienation remain, and ironically, residents who are socially well-connected otherwise can live in an apartment for years without any interaction with their neighbours or even knowing who lives next to them. We believe that this situation is acceptable as long as it is due to personal choice and not due to a lack of opportunity for local engagement and participation.

Approaches towards neighbourhood development that try to provide such opportunities are mostly based on an utopian objective to try and establish a collective community spirit. They are afflicted with difficulties, because it is impossible to 'make everyone love everyone else'. Physical proximity does not ensure neighbourliness (Arnold *et al.*, 2003; Foth, 2006, forthcoming). Hence, approaches to encourage and support interaction amongst residents has to be based on voluntary action and choice to cater for different lifestyles and social needs.

It would be nice to know my neighbors. (Resident at Alpha)

I'm not really interested in meeting others to any great extent. (Resident at Melba)

Nevertheless, no resident who participated in our study rejects the assumption that chances are good that there are residents who share their interests or are at least compatible at the personality level with whom they do not normally interact on a daily basis. If these residents could be identified easily, they may transgress the status of 'neighbour' and become new acquaintances and maybe even friends. How can the residential architecture and design of public space stimulate, encourage and support social interaction and networking between residents? We suggest three pathways which we will discuss in turn.

Serendipity

'Bumping into someone' has been reported as the most common form of interaction between residents. These kinds of serendipitous encounters take place in the elevator, at the pool, in the car park, whilst taking out the garbage or walking the dogs. Yet, depending on individual personalities and social preferences, such concurrences may remain without consequence unless people already know each other.

I feel people are generally sociable to all residents, they will generally say hi, but a more lengthy chat usually occurs between those groups that know each other. (Resident at Melba)

Most people are reasonably friendly. It is hard to determine who is a resident and who is just visiting most of the time. Generally most people are reasonably friendly. I would say I would most likely chat to a familiar face rather than a new one unless it was obvious they were just moving in. (Resident at Sigma)

On the other hand, residents of a proactive nature may take the opportunity of repeat serendipitous encounters to get to know other residents and to explore possible new frontiers of their existing social networks on the basis of shared demographics or interests.

Depends on my mood and their body language, if they look friendly such as smile at me and make eye contact... or if they avoid eye contact, you know they don't want to talk, but I am always up to meeting new people. (Resident at Alpha)

Mostly everyone tries hard not to talk to each other unless they are constantly bumping into the same person and it becomes awkward not to talk. I have managed to become good friends with a once [Sigma] resident, just because we were similar ages, have similar interests and often ended up in the lift together and started chatting. (Resident at Sigma)

The design of public space in residential apartment buildings substantially influences the likelihood, frequency, and intensity of serendipitous encounters. The only public space at Melba where serendipitous encounters happen on a regular basis is the underground car park, however, informal chats are awkward, because the environment is dark and uninviting, and residents usually rush between their car and the entrance to their staircase. The absence of paths and pedestrian walk ways in Sigma's site layout favours access by car and makes it difficult for residents to casually visit each other by foot. Alpha's common room on Level 3 has been equipped with board games, a ping-pong and a pool table, but the overall impression of this large and clinically white room is not very welcoming and conducive to socialise with other residents.

Sociocultural Animation

The public barbecue sites at Alpha and Melba have been used successfully in the past to invite all residents to get together for a community barbecue. Although not every resident shows up, most residents that attend such organised events welcome the opportunity to gain a better awareness of who lives in the complex and meet old friends and new acquaintances.

It is easier to break the ice when someone else does it for you or it is less confrontational. (Resident at Sigma)

Group meetings are a bit daunting especially when the people who usually attend these things all know each other. (Resident at Sigma)

If people want to interact they can and it doesn't force those people who wish to go about their existence in the unit as they wish. Also add a bit of alcohol and people tend to loosen up a bit. (Resident at Melba)

These and other acts of sociocultural animation (Foth, 2005) allow residents to take the initiative to organise collective action. They may take various forms from community barbecues, donation appeals or landscape rejuvenation programs to the establishment of residential community associations (Foth & Brereton, 2004). The location and facilitation of such activities requires appropriate public spaces – both physical and virtual – that cater for mixed-use and that offer a heterogeneous fit-out to suit a variety of technical and social needs. Audience sizes change and it is essential that these spaces can be re-appropriated and re-purposed for different contexts and circumstances.

Digital Augmentation

Residents at Alpha have broadband access to the internet through a local area network with Ethernet sockets in every bedroom. Most residents at Melba and Sigma have dial-up or broadband internet access at home. These favourable conditions allow residents to explore the potential to develop and install a community network system as a virtual outlet for social interaction to compliment existing physical public spaces.

Theories of networked individualism and social networks do not only have an impact on the residential architecture of physical public space, but also on the systems architecture of virtual public space. A prototype system called the “Urban Tribe Incubator” is currently under development which takes into account the emerging requirements of the new social formations in the network society. It departs from a collectivist-only view of community interaction and seeks to integrate a peer-to-peer model inherent in social networking. The theoretical rationale and design considerations can be found in Foth (2006, forthcoming).

The system provides a range of opportunities for digital augmentation which affords a cross-integration of virtual and physical public space. Examples include:

- resident directories that contain member profiles and – upon request – become interactive to indicate whether a ‘buddy resident’ is at home and available to come over for dinner;
- ambient devices that provide background information about the neighbourhood and personal social networks;
- remote surveillance and monitoring of public and private space to increase security;
- location- and context-aware instant messengers that indicate not just the availability of buddies but also their location, and that are cross-platform (computer, mobile phone/ wearables, internet fridge); and,
- interactive community information displays integrated in existing public spaces such as shopping malls or public libraries. Our team is working on this initiative to explore the potential of large-scale touch-sensitive public displays that provide neighbourhood information and interaction (Foth & Brereton, 2004; Viller *et al.*, 2004).

5. CONCLUSION

Good design in housing remains scarce, however innovations in the infrastructure of social space have emerged, the Dutch architect Herman Hertzberger has established principles in social residential projects that targets circulation spaces (staircase, landings and balcony corridors) as opportunities for incidental exchange. On enlarged stairway landings, seating is provided, a simple gesture that allows for resting on the ascent to an apartment, a place to meet. Similarly, external corridors are articulated with protrusion outside apartment front doors that also encourage engagement through the opportunity to appropriate a balcony space, although part of the public domain is cared for as if private. For examples, see Hertzberger (2000) and Lüchinger (1987). These simple gestures inform how, with a dimension in design thinking beyond the mere functional minimum, the in-between spaces within a residential development can become more than just circulation.

To Mitchell (2004) designing flexible, permeable, informal public spaces is key in establishing a positive social space as demonstrated at Steven Holl’s polemical Simmons Hall Undergraduate Residence, MIT

campus, Cambridge, USA (Amelar, 2003; Ryan, 2004). Holl's philosophy of an architectural porosity enables the building to incorporate a cavernous series of volumes cutting through various stories, these vertical shafts are aligned with group lounges and study spaces, the network of spaces allows for a multiplicity of social events. The buildings plan is based on the traditional central corridor spine, however the departure from the conventional monotonous circulation system through the augmentation of public meeting spaces demonstrates a viable model for residential developments.

The diagram of Simmons Hall, and its physical exploration, is as if Le Corbusier's economic section of stacked maisonettes for his Unités d'Habitation has mutated with surprisingly spatial, almost surreal incidental volumes. The student rooms, typically paired about small threshold spaces and shared bathrooms, are aligned between floor slabs to either side of the central corridor – a new sort of internal street – whereas the multi-height communal rooms punch through this straightjacket, morphing vertically – in the case of upper rooms – towards fantastical roof lights clear to the sky. (Ryan, 2004, p. 37)

These 'internal streets', inter-dispersed with places for social gathering, recall the earlier models of terraced housing and street corner public houses.

The fact that urban environments in the network society are characterised by fast-paced technological change and a swarming social behaviour of its inhabitants requires a cross-disciplinary exchange between urban sociology, computer science, architecture and urban design disciplines to inform urban planning and public policy making. Design considerations around privacy, exclusivity, permeability, and flexibility have to be re-thought in a new light alongside traditional values of access, scale, scope, form and function. If the modern city is to become a dynamic conglomeration of livable 'urban villages', a variety of network effects need to be investigated further. In the process of urban renewal, apartment buildings are becoming an essential component of the physical fabric of urban environments. They provide an integral part of the infrastructure for social networks. Their significance in the design and development of public spaces that become the new agora of urban dwellers opens up exciting opportunities for research and innovation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is supported by ACID (the Australasian CRC for Interaction Design) established and supported under the Cooperative Research Centres Programme through the Australian Government's Department of Education, Science and Training. The authors would like to thank Greg Hearn, Barbara Adkins, Dianne Smith, Fiorella De Cindio, Storm Griffin, Michael Docherty, Margot Brereton, the editors and anonymous reviewers, and all participants at our case study sites.

REFERENCES

- Amelar, S. (2003). Steven Holl experiments with constructed "porosity" in his design for SIMMONS HALL, an undergraduate dorm set in the scientific realm of MIT. *Architectural Record*, 191(5), 204-215.
- Arnold, M., Gibbs, M. R., & Wright, P. (2003). Intranets and Local Community: 'Yes, an intranet is all very well, but do we still get free beer and a barbeque?' In M. Huysman, E. Wenger & V. Wulf (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Communities and Technologies* (pp. 185-204). Amsterdam, NL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2004). *Year Book Australia: Population. Article: How many people live in Australia's remote areas?* (No. 1301.0). Canberra, ACT: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Baker, P. M. A., & Ward, A. C. (2002). Bridging Temporal and Spatial 'Gaps': The role of information and communication technologies in defining communities. *Information, Communication & Society*, 5(2), 207-224.
- Castells, M. (2000). *The Rise of the Network Society* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Castells, M. (2001). Virtual Communities or Network Society? In *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society* (pp. 116-136). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Castells, M. (2004). Space of Flows, Space of Places: Materials for a Theory of Urbanism in the Information Age. In S. Graham (Ed.), *The Cybercities Reader* (pp. 82-93). London: Routledge.

- Day, P. (2002). Designing Democratic Community Networks: Involving Communities through Civil Participation. In M. Tanabe, P. van den Besselaar & T. Ishida (Eds.), *Digital Cities II: Second Kyoto Workshop on Digital Cities* (Vol. LNCS 2362, pp. 86-100). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- De Villiers, P. (1997). New Urbanism: A critical review. *Australian Planner*, 34, 30-34.
- DiMaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Neuman, W. R., & Robinson, J. P. (2001). Social Implications of the Internet. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 307-336.
- Fallows, D. (2004). *The Internet and Daily Life*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project.
- Florida, R. L. (2003). Cities and the Creative Class. *City and Community*, 2(1), 3-19.
- Foth, M. (2005). Sociocultural Animation. In S. Marshall, W. Taylor & X. Yu (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Developing Regional Communities with Information and Communication Technology*. London: Idea Group Reference.
- Foth, M. (2006, forthcoming). Analysing the factors influencing the successful design and uptake of interactive systems to support social networks in urban neighbourhoods. *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction*, 2(2).
- Foth, M., & Brereton, M. (2004). Enabling local interaction and personalised networking in residential communities through action research and participatory design. In P. Hyland & L. Vrazalic (Eds.), *Proceedings of OZCHI 2004: Supporting Community Interaction. 20-24 Nov 2004*. Wollongong, NSW: University of Wollongong.
- Gleeson, B. (2004). Deprogramming Planning: Collaboration and Inclusion in New Urban Development. *Urban Policy and Research*, 22(3), 315-322.
- Gleeson, B., Darbas, T., & Lawson, S. (2004). Governance, Sustainability and Recent Australian Metropolitan Strategies: A Socio-theoretic Analysis. *Urban Policy and Research*, 22(4), 345-366.
- Graham, S. (Ed.). (2004). *The Cybercities Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Healy, E., & Birrell, B. (2004). *Housing and Community in the Compact City* (Positioning Paper). Melbourne, VIC: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Hearn, G., & Foth, M. (2005). Action Research in the Design of New Media and ICT Systems. In K. Kwansah-Aidoo (Ed.), *Topical Issues in Communications and Media Research* (pp. 81-97). New York, NY: Nova Science.
- Hertzberger, H. (2000). *Space and the Architect: Lessons in Architecture 2* (J. Kirkpatrick, Trans.). Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.
- Horrigan, J. B. (2001). *Cities Online: Urban Development and the Internet*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project.
- Lovink, G. (2005). The Importance of Going Public. In S. Lehmann (Ed.), *Absolutely Public. Crossover: Art and Architecture* (pp. 46-48). Melbourne: Images Publishing.
- Lüchinger, A. (Ed.). (1987). *Herman Hertzberger: Bauten und Projekte [Buildings and Projects] 1959-1986*. Den Haag, NL: Arch-Edition.
- Mitchell, W. J. (2003). *Me++: The Cyborg Self and the Networked City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Oldenburg, R. (2001). *Celebrating the Third Place*. New York: Marlowe & Co.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Queensland Government. (2004). *Draft South East Queensland Regional Plan*. Brisbane, QLD: Office of Urban Management, Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation.
- Randolph, B. (2004). The Changing Australian City: New Patterns, New Policies and New Research Needs. *Urban Policy and Research*, 22(4), 481-493.
- Ryan, R. (2004). Kinetic Monolith. *The Architectural Review*, 215(1283), 36-41.
- Viller, S. A., Brereton, M., Redhead, F., Axup, J., Donald, S. H., & Billingham, M. (2004, Nov 6-10). *Designing shared community information spaces*. Paper presented at the workshop "Exploring the Role of Information, Information Tools, and Information Environments in Collaboration" at the ACM conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW), Chicago, IL.
- Walmsley, D. J. (2000). Community, Place and Cyberspace. *Australian Geographer*, 31(1), 5-19.
- Watters, E. (2003). How Tribes Connect A City. In *Urban Tribes: Are Friends the New Family?* (pp. 95-118). London: Bloomsbury.
- Wellman, B. (2001). Physical Place and Cyberplace: The Rise of Personalized Networking. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25(2), 227-252.
- Wellman, B. (2002). Little Boxes, Glocalization, and Networked Individualism. In M. Tanabe, P. van den Besselaar & T. Ishida (Eds.), *Digital Cities II: Second Kyoto Workshop on Digital Cities* (Vol. LNCS 2362, pp. 10-25). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Ziller, A. (2004). The Community is Not a Place and Why it Matters - Case Study: Green Square. *Urban Policy and Research*, 22(4), 465-479.