STUDY OF PROJECTS AND PLANS FOR SOCIAL HOUSING
HISTORY OF SOCIAL HOUSING IN ARGENTINA

1850-1900
- Migration from Europe to Argentina- 1950
- Creation "immigrants hotels"
- Yellow fever epidemic
- 1st national law to regulate housing problem
- First social housing projects (Butteler, Patricios and Rivadavia's neighborhood)
- Cheap housing plan (Cafferata, Rawson, MT Alvarez, Nazca, Segurola neighborhood)

1900-1950
- 1944 Creation of the National Administration Office for Housing
- 1940- Migration from the countryside and neighbor countries- Big unemployment
- Emerging of informal settlements
- Military government dictatorship
- Federal plan for housing
- First competition for social housing: CHEAP HOUSING
  - 15000 dwellings (Lugano I y II)
- Plan VEA-35000 dwellings
- Plan 17 October- 102000 dwellings
- Plan FONAVI- 102000 dwellings
- Federal system for housing
PROBLEM in the social housing today

Why is necessary to change something there?

ARCHITECT ROLE

no design in the dwellings
the dwellings look the same everywhere for the last 40 years

no innovation
same as 40 years ago

no relation with the client
when developing the neighborhood there is no communication between the architect and the people who is going to live there. 50 to 70% of the people who moved to a social housing neighborhood wants to move out.

no individuality
one of the reasons why they want to move out is because they don’t feel identified with the image of the neighborhood.

no flexibility
in poor neighborhoods families are composed by more than 5 members.

bad ubication
families are dislocated from their neighborhood and placed in other place in the outskirts of the city, without job opportunities and totally excluded from society

drugs

criminality

forgotten for the government

bad relationship with the new neighbors
REFERENCE PROJECTS
B- PARQUE SAAVEDRA
Buenos Aires, Argentina 1949

Programme: 428 dwellings, a church, a school and a commercial center. The typology is single housing buildings. The houses are placed surrounding a park.

- **public space**: the park in the center gives a different characteristic and privilege to the neighborhood.
- **good quality**: the buildings are well preserved and that is sign of a well accepted social housing neighborhood.
  
  Good quality makes the maintenance easier.
- **individuality**: variety in the house facade and typology. Details and decoration are part of the project which makes it an attractive place.
- **flexibility**: the lots are too small for extensions, but this does not decrease the popularity of the neighborhood.

Land area: 281089m²
Occupied area: 120801 m² (1/3 garden for the house)
Green spaces/public spaces: 98088m²
Height buildings: 1 and 2 storeys

fsi: 1
428 dwellings
Dwelling size promedy: 123m²
Population: ?
24m²/person approximately
C- SIMON BOLIVAR
Héctor Farina Rice, Bs As, Argentina, 1953

6 buildings of 10 to 12 storey floors, 676 apartments of 3 or 4 rooms.

- **good location**: the neighborhood was built inside the city and it has access to public transport.
- **planned public space**: public space gives a privilege in the zone where no other buildings has a garden. It also contains a lot of vegetation which makes it very attractive and successful in the block.
- **good quality**: the buildings are well preserved and that is sign of a well accepted social housing neighborhood. Good quality makes the maintenance easier.
- **individuality**: the stetisc of the buildings gives individuality to the neighborhood.

- **no flexibility**
- **size**: as a block building is difficult its maintenance.

Land area: 36808m²
Occupied area: 5763m²
Green spaces/public spaces: 31072m²
Height buildings: 13 storey.

fsi: 2
676 dwellings
Dwelling size promedy: 90m²
Population: ?
D- FUERTE APACHE
Buenos Aires, Argentina 1970

It was built under the dictature of Ongania at the end of the 60’s. It is constituted by 25 towers, which means 4200 apartments with a population of 35.000 people. Is one of the most dangerous places in America.

- **public space:** the public space surrounds the towers, but it is maybe not enough space for 30000 people.

- **bad quality:** the buildings are in very bad conditions, there is no quality in the building materials and no maintenance.

- **no individuality:** the 25 towers look all the same. No details in facades, no decoration elements.

- **no flexibility:** the complex is constituted by apartments, which makes it impossible to expand.

- **bad location:** 25 towers with 35.000 people living in the outskirts of the city. No integration with society. Very high criminality rates.
F- CASAS ÚTILES  
eSTUDIO vS, Guanajuato, México, 2007-2010

Área: 79,455 m² – 732 viviendas [1ª etapa]

It was understood that the economy did not allowed to build finished big houses, so the project proposes a block of 4,50x10,50 mts constituted by two principal zones: the staircase and a bathroom, and one bedroom and a multiple use room. Every block has a back garden of 4,50 by 2,50m; this proposes that the extensions are done on the back of the house and upon the roof.

✓ flexibility: space for future extensions
✓ individuality: just on the extention. The architects “decided how the upper part will look, but it is very doubtful that the inhabitants will follow it.

✗ bad location: the project is placed in the outskirts of the city, new infrastructure had to be included which probable made the costs higher. No opportunity for jobs, no facilities, no integration with society
no definition for traffic and pedestrian circulation
✗ no planed public space
✗ no communication with the future inhabitants, no address to their willings.

First place competition energy-efficient social housing: MINUV/CASAPATIO, Chile.

Competition for a prototype of energy-efficient social housing. The proposal had to be placed in a generic block of 200 by 100 meters, with a maximum of 150 houses. It should be included traffic and pedestrian circulation, public spaces, green areas and equipment. Finished structure dividing blocks of 3m by 3m.

- **flexibility**: space for future extensions, possibility for the people to choose where their basic blocks are going to be located.
- **individuality**: possibility for inhabitants to give their house the look they want.
- **no definition for traffic and pedestrian circulation**

- **no location**: difficult to know if the project will succeed when it is not addressed to a certain group of people and determined location.
- **no definition for the public space**: without this definition there is no certainty of who is going to take care of it and it will be probably not used.
The project handles with social housing. The typologies are flexible so that the different lots could be used in the amount that the family, who is going to live there, needs. The set backs in the buildings creates public space and share infrastructure, such as laundry.

- **flexibility**: space for future extensions.
- **public space**: the set backs of the house plan gives place for public space which can be used as a square or as a market.
- **defined traffic and pedestrian circulation**: one street for cars in the block, the rest is pedestrian.
- **define infrastructure**: planning the infrastructure for the neighborhood is very important because is one of the things that they can't build by themselves.
Social housing for 100 families in Quinta Monroy, Chile which were living in an illegally occupied lot of 5000 sqm big in Iquique, Chile. The current Housing Policy gives a subsidy of US$ 7,500 for paying for the land, infrastructure and architecture in the site. This amount of money just allows to build 30 sqm of build space per lot. This would mean that only 30 families would be able to move. The lots then where maximized to be used for three families.

- **flexibility**: space for future extensions
- **individuality**: possibility for inhabitants to give their house, the look they want.
- **right location**: the neighborhood is located in the city and people stayed in their old lots.
- **knowledge of inhabitants interest**.

- **no definition for traffic and pedestrian circulation**.
- **no definition for the public space**: without this definition there is no certainty of who is going to take care of it and it will be probably not used.

far: 2
lot area: 4646m²
occupied area: 3105m²
free area: 1541m²
9m²/person
The projects placed close to the city and to infrastructure worked better than the projects situated in the outskirts of the city. People are closer to job opportunities and are integrated to planned public space with greenery and different planned functions and activities worked well and are still well preserved, while small squares or just land fields are not used.

Individual house or multiple family building? INDIVIDUAL HOUSE

FLEXIBILITY: Individual housing gives the opportunity for the owner to expand their houses.

OWNERSHIP RECOGNITION: individual housing gives the certainty of ownership, which means that it is very clear who has to make the maintenance.

PERSONAL INTEREST: people want to have an individual house.

COSTS: cost for maintenance and for construction are bigger in block housing.

MAINTENANCE: in blocks means agreement between neighbors which often is difficult.

COEXISTING: blocks contains more people in less space who comes from slums, which makes coexisting often more difficult.

Social housing projects from 1920 to 1960, when good quality in materials were used have been more succesful and are still in good shape today. It is possible to see that the people in those projects apreciated details in construction and took care better of their homes. It is also easier for manteinance when the material has good quality.

Flexible individual housing projects have being the most successful, this is because slums are constitute by big family groups and certainty or regularity are not often found.

Projects with diversity of dwellings and details, different facades or just different terminations are the ownes that today have increased in value and are best maintained.

Projects with population up to 400 families have shown that can work, but often those which are bigger tend to become a high problem (as in Fuerte Apache example).
ELECTION OF A RIGHT HOUSING POLITIC

1. study and investigation of projects and plans build in Argentina and in other countries
   select and analize good and bad examples, why did they succeed and why they didn't do it, to be able to take as reference for the new project.

2. terrain studies

3. knowledge about the inhabitants
   knowledge of their needs, interests, preocupations and all aspects that are important.
   participation of the future inhabitants, not only for them to know the characteristics, but also for them to be able to manifest themselves and to defend their rights.

4. urban planification

5. the house as a finish element with its materials, technology and quality
   the house is not just a roof or a shelter, but also a socialization instrument.
   construction system, adaptation to the zone where is going to be built, rooms sizes, termination details, etc.

The final objective is not only to finish with the housing problem but also to give a better quality of living to the population in general.