

# Statement of Errata

Name: Hugh Strange

Title: Architecture at the Building Site

Challenging the Separation between Design and Construction

The following typographical errors have been addressed:

p.1, line 1, comma after 'House' omitted.

p.1, line 3, comma after 'family' omitted.

p.7, para 3, line 1, 'attests' amended to 'attests to'.

p.7, para 3, line 2, commas added around 'with the building'.

p.20, para 4, line 1, Palace capitalised.

p.21, para 1, line 5, 'de-basing' amended to 'debasings'.

p.21, para 2, line 2, 'between man and man within society, and between man and nature' amended to 'between humans within society, and between humans and nature'.

p.31, penultimate line, '*De Re Aedifactoria*' amended to '*De Re Aedificatoria*'.

p.44, first quote, line 5, 'Shaw' amended to 'Shaw's'.

p.54, para 1, line 6, 'Country Life' amended to '*Country Life*'.

p.80, lines 2/3, 'had later been identified by' amended to 'was later identified by'.

p.86, para 2, line 3, 'fermented' amended to 'fomented'.

p.95, para 2, line 1, 'Illustrated London News' amended to '*Illustrated London News*'.

p.122, line 8, comma after 'only' omitted.

p.126, para 3, line 1, commas added around 'he suggested'.

p.143, para 2, penultimate line, 'draughting' amended to 'drafting'.

p.252, para 4, line 1, 'its' amended to 'its'.

In addition, at the committee's request, an additional page has been added to better clarify the aims of the research, situate the text in the academic landscape and state the academic methods, while also outlining key research decisions taken that have shaped the direction of the research. To this effect, the single page 'Summary' that precedes the thesis has been amended to two pages.

This previously read as follows:

## Summary

This thesis makes the case for an architecture that emerges through the process of construction.

The research investigates how, within the context of industrialised England from 1830 to 1980, the historic separation between designing and building in the production of architecture developed, and how it continues to define our contemporary building culture. It focusses on the impact of this development on labour and construction, and examines both the agency of those who construct, and the role of the architect, particularly as understood through drawings and related documentation. The research reviews critiques of this 'partitioning' and looks at ways in which it has been challenged through alternative models of architectural practice.

The research is structured around studies of three buildings sites. I have read the construction of the Great Stove at Chatsworth in the 1830s, to Joseph Paxton's design, as exemplar of the impact of the factory system and machinery on the production of architecture, with the resulting replacement on site of skilled craftsmen by unskilled labour. Following this, William Lethaby, working within the context of the Arts and Crafts in the 1890s and early 1900s, changed his working methodology, producing fewer drawing before construction, to integrate craftsmen into an ongoing design process at the building site. And from the 1960s onwards, Walter Segal, in developing a radically simplified construction methodology, sought to make designing and building accessible to all.

In arguing that architects (and architecture) should re-embrace construction, the temporal process and labour of building, and the creative space of the building site, the thesis proposes – despite all the obstacles - both a political project of renewed agency within the production of architecture, and a parallel revitalisation of the architectural artefact.

And now reads:

## Summary

This thesis addresses the relationship of construction to design in the production of architecture. To approach this, the research examines the distance that exists between the two, charting how this has developed and how it continues to define our contemporary building culture. The text focusses in turn on examples of resistance and challenge to this tendency and proceeds to argue more broadly for an architecture that emerges through, and from, the process of construction. Developing from themes within my own work, this research aims to position the ideas of the practice within a wider context. More broadly it aims to develop an argument that architects (and architecture) should re-embrace construction, the temporal process and labour of building, and the creative space of the building site.

The methodology is thus informed by my experience as a practitioner concerned with the processes and details of construction. My investigation of the issues surrounding how buildings come into being starts from precise readings of construction details developed through professional experience, rather than from theories, and leads on to broader conclusions. The chapters comprising this thesis are undertaken as close readings of construction. I cross-reference the critical interrogation of archive-based historical construction documentation with the examination of actual buildings and bibliographic research, varying to the extent that these are available in each case. A supplementary chapter takes a different approach, interviewing a key participant; excerpts from this transcript combine with their own site images to form a photographic essay.

Situated between an earlier discourse relating to the culture of construction (tectonics), and a more recent 'turn to labour' and material discourse, the thesis seeks to simultaneously consider architectural artefact and architectural production. In this, the research is led by a sustained effort to situate each figure and study in their historical moment, yet each study may also be considered to operate allegorically. At the same time, the thesis follows a tradition of established practitioners who have written in parallel to their own design work, internationally and within a British context, from

Alison and Peter Smithson onwards, that has addressed construction within a cultural context. The thesis has also benefitted from the supervision of Pier Vittorio Aureli, whose consistent concern for the relationship between architectural history and political theory has informed the spirit of the whole.

When first contemplating the structure of the thesis I considered a series of architects preoccupied with the nature of 'building', some of whom I felt close to in my own practice – Sigurd Lewerentz, Sverre Fehn – but also some as counterpoints - Carlo Scarpa. While this might have related closely to my own practice, I wanted to address underlying themes, and proceeded to cases that represented more overt relationships between designing and making. These included Michelangelo's development from a sculptor handling material directly, to an architect instructing workmen at one remove, and of the Perret brothers, operating both a concrete construction company, and through Auguste, an architectural practice. This might have brought geographic breadth and allowed the thesis to develop apart from the British discourse led by John Ruskin and William Morris on the relationship of designing and making.

But, after completing a first text on William Lethaby in January 2020, and concerned with embarking on archival research outside my mother tongue, the pandemic forced my hand. Unable to leave my immediate neighbourhood to visit buildings or archives, and not knowing how long such restrictions might last, I chose to research Walter Segal, whose key buildings were close to where I lived. His former assistant Jon Broome also lived nearby and was happy to share archival documents across the distance of a park bench. This study, together with that of Lethaby's work, provided a geographical focus to the thesis. Seeking historical breadth, and aware that the time between these two was approximately the same as that between Segal and my own practice, I decided to look for an earlier case study, alighting on Joseph Paxton's first greenhouses at Chatsworth of the 1830s.

Thus, the choice of three historic building sites allows for comparative investigation of these themes within the context of industrialised England from 1830 to 1980. The focus is on labour and construction, and examines both the agency of those who construct, and the role of the architect.