

**Figure 6.15** Kresge College, University of California at Santa Cruz. (a) The college layout and (b) a view of the 'street' in 1993.

redwood trees in the background. Much attention focused on the internal design of the college, what it should and should not accommodate, the appropriate size for student groups using a hierarchy of common facilities, where they would interact, and how teaching and living spaces should be connected.

Those who inhabit the design are generally well satisfied with it as a living and working world. One of the difficulties with the participatory design is that those who are engaged in the programming are not necessarily those who will inhabit the building. The students who participated in developing the program envisaged the showers as communal spaces, but those who have inhabited the scheme have perceived the kitchens to be the locus of daily interactions. Space would have been allocated slightly differently if this behaviour had been predicted. In addition, there is a tendency to over-estimate how much people will go

about changing internal designs to suit their peculiar needs. The students have not changed much. After 30 years of operation the original design has proven to be robust. Some elements of the social and physical program of the college have proven to be expensive to maintain. By 1987 maintenance costs of running the complex had risen from an original \$31 to \$212 per student per annum and have continued to rise. The simplicity of the architecture has, however, survived changes in architectural fashions very well indeed.

What was created at Kresge College is an academic 'village'. As such it is an urban design. As a single work, it is architecture! The focus of attention in developing the design was very much on the interrelation of open and enclosed space, and on the public and the private realms of student life. The concern was with the aesthetic function of the complex as a unifying element. It was designed as much for providing a sense of