

## Aarhus School of Architecture // Design School Kolding // Royal Danish Academy

### (Re)making the Haubarg

Andersen, Nicolai Bo; Julebæk, Victor Boye

*Published in:*  
Design for Rethinking Resources

*Publication date:*  
2023

*Document Version:*  
Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication](#)

#### *Citation for pulished version (APA):*

Andersen, N. B., & Julebæk, V. B. (2023). (Re)making the Haubarg: Towards Sustainable Dwelling on a Bounded Earth. In M. Ramsgaard Thomsen, C. Ratti, & M. Tamke (Eds.), *Design for Rethinking Resources: Proceedings of the UIA World Congress of Architects Copenhagen 2023* (pp. 249-262). <http://papers.uia2023cph.org/P2/3019.pdf>

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Mette Ramsgaard Thomsen  
Carlo Ratti  
Martin Tamke *Editors*

# Design for Rethinking Resources

Proceedings of the UIA World Congress  
of Architects Copenhagen 2023

## (Re)Making The Haubarg i 1/2 Towards Sustainable Dwelling On A Bounded Earth

Nicolai Bo Andersen | Victor Julebæk

Contact author affiliation: Royal Danish Academy i 1/2 Architecture

**PREPRINT // OPEN ACCESS**



# (Re)making the Haubarg—Towards Sustainable Dwelling on a Bounded Earth

Nicolai Bo Andersen and Victor Julebæk

## Keywords

Materials · Tectonics · Architecture ·  
Aesthetics · Sustainability

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Architecture may be understood as a material practice where resources extracted from nature are deployed in a building system and cultivated to make a dwelling. However, on a bounded planet, material resources are limited (Daly, 2007) and the safe operating space of numerous planetary boundaries are long exceeded (Rockström et al., 2009; Steffen et al., 2015; Raworth, 2012; 2018). Accounting for 36% of European CO2 emissions and 40% of the total European energy consumption (European Commission, 2021), the construction industry constitutes a

major part of the problem and in consequence – if any hope of meeting the Paris Agreement (UN FCCC, 2015) should be kept alive – architectural design processes must be fundamentally revised. Wood has been used as building material in vernacular architecture around the world for thousands of years. The material may be considered a renewable resource and potentially abundant, carbon neutral and recyclable and as such the only widely used building material that is sustainable when coming from truly sustainable forestry. As such, enhancing carbon uptake and storage through bio-based building materials in construction may be one effective mitigation strategy (IPCC, 2022). However, the environmental benefits of using timber are not straightforward (Ramage et al., 2017; Dooley et al., 2018) just as traditional knowledge of how to design with wood seems inadequate in contemporary architectural design. It seems as if contemporary sustainable design strategies are less concerned with the qualitative potential of wood, just as it seems as if the work of architecture is regarded a conceptual exercise, detached from tectonic, cultural-historic or contextual considerations. As such, it seems necessary to rethink the qualitative potential of wood in contemporary architectural design practice aiming at (more) sustainable building culture(s).

N. B. Andersen (✉)  
Royal Danish Academy—Architecture,  
Copenhagen, Denmark  
e-mail: [nande@kgalakademi.dk](mailto:nande@kgalakademi.dk)

V. Julebæk  
Centre for Sustainable Building Culture, Royal  
Danish Academy—Architecture, Copenhagen,  
Denmark

AQ1



## 1.2 Research Question

This paper understands sustainable building culture as the meaningful synthesis of technical properties, cultural-historical qualities, and experiential effects – in careful consideration of the planetary boundaries. Through the (re)making of the Haubarg at the Danish Open Air Museum, this paper aims at investigating the topic of Rethinking Resources, supplementing and qualifying the qualitative potential of wood as a sustainable building material as informed by traditional building culture – seen in a holistic perspective. It is asked how knowledge embodied in crafts tradition and local vernacular (with specific focus on timber construction) may inform a contemporary design practice and inspire the development of (more) sustainable building culture(s). The (re)making of the Haubarg – understood in and of itself as a production of authentic architectural knowledge – is considered an empirical finding that is described and analysed seen through a phenomenological-hermeneutic lens. The significance of the results is discussed in relation to the overall question of sustainable building culture. It is argued that technical properties, cultural-historical qualities as well as experiential effects must be taken into consideration when building with wood. Conveying architectural meaning as *dwelling*, the (re)making of the Haubarg may thus inspire a renewed sustainable building culture in careful consideration of the biophysically bounded Earth.

## 2 Materials and Methods

The research method in this paper is a combined strategy (Groat and Wang, 2013), involving a qualitative, in-depth analysis of an existing building and the design and construction of an experimental timber structure. The analysis of the existing building is seen from the perspectives of technical properties, cultural-historical qualities and, experiential effects, all following a phenomenological-hermeneutic approach

aiming to identify architectural motifs that may point towards new architectural interventions.

The phenomenological method (Andersen, 2018) comprises five stages: 1) experiencing an architectural phenomenon; 2) investigating the architectural phenomenon; 3) hermeneutical reflection; 4) describing the architectural phenomenon and 5) architectural phenomenological re-presentation. The phenomenological descriptions developed in the article, build on the framework detailed by the phenomenological method. The method is used as a way of thinking the world through experience, aiming at articulating, structuring, operationalizing, and presenting experienced architectural phenomena in text and drawing. The method is based on the phenomenological-hermeneutic philosophy as developed by Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty and the phenomenology of practice as described by Max van Manen in combination with the concept of embodied communication as developed in the new phenomenology by Hermann Schmitz (2014; 2016; 2019).

It is important to underline, that a purely qualitative approach does not in itself lead to a tangible and measurable sustainable building culture. As pointed out by ICOMOS (2019), however, climate science can tell us that adaptation and mitigation are necessary, but it cannot tell us what adaptation options are most workable within any given human system. Balancing economic, social, and environmental concerns, the UN Rio Conference on Environment and Development highlights the need for qualitative perspectives in a future sustainable development as does the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In this perspective, cultural heritage may, according to ICOMOS, be considered “[...] a source of creativity and inspiration for adaptation and mitigation actions that are responses to the findings of climate science.” (ICOMOS, 2019, p. 14). In continuation, this paper aims at inspiring future sustainable building culture(s) based on the findings of climate science, in this case through pointing at the need to rethink the use of wood in an ar-



chitectural design practice – all seen in a holistic perspective. As such, the aim is not to exclude, but rather to supplement and qualify contemporary discussions on the climate crises, including the question of carbon footprint.

The design of the experimental timber structure is considered a “reflective practice” (Schön, 1986; 2001) involving the continuous analysis and action performed in working with a complex and/or unique problem – in this case the design of an experimental timber structure as informed by an existing building. It concerns the architect’s experience, the understanding of the specific situation and a reflection on the presumed outcome. A “reflective practice” comprises “knowing-in-action”, the general, practical knowledge we exhibit in our intelligent, physical performance; “reflection-in-action” in which experience, knowledge, and intuition works in exchange with the action itself and “reflection on reflection-in-action”, which is the retrospective analysis, which again indirectly may influence a future action (Schön, 1986; 2001).

First, characteristic motives from the historic Ejdersted Farmhouse, originally called *Rothelau* and today located at the Danish Open Air Museum, have been identified, described, and organised (fig. 1, 2). Aiming to get a better understanding of a given architectural phenomenon, the motives relate to technical properties, cultural-historical qualities, and experiential effects. Second, selected motives have informed an architectural design (fig. 3, 4, 5), constituting a contemporary re-interpretation of the traditional marsh Farmhouse. Through a “reflective dialogue with the situation” in a larger “network of choice”, this “reflective practice” investigates the different so called “Normative/Descriptive Design Domains” (Schön, 2001), in this case related to technical properties, cultural-historical qualities, and experiential effects. The aim of the architectural design has been to make a new architectural entity, clearly relating to the motifs identified in the historic building, yet unmistakably autonomous.

Third, the experimental timber structure has been built by students at The Royal Danish

Academy – Cultural Heritage, Transformation, and Conservation as part of the master program curriculum (fig. 6). The Haubarg has been described and documented photographically (fig. 3, 4) and the material – which in itself may be understood as authentic architectural knowledge – is considered empirical findings that have been described and analysed as a “reflection on reflection-in-action” (Schön, 1986; 2001). Finally, the significance of the results of the (re)making of the Haubarg are discussed in relation to the overall research question regarding the development of (more) sustainable building culture(s) and a conclusion is made.

## 3 3 Results and Analysis

### 3.1 Cultural-Historical Qualities



The historic Rothelau Farmhouse was originally located in the tidal marshland of the Ejdersted province on a reclaimed area protected from the sea by dikes. The landscape was structured by a large patchwork of dams, divided by drainage canals, sluices and ponds. To further protect the buildings against floods and potential breaches of the dike, the Farmhouse itself was built on a *warf*, a large, humanmade dwelling mound. Built in 1651, the Rothelau Farmhouse was one of the oldest in Ejdersted (Pedersen, 2004, p.44). The building is characterised by a single large roof supported by four tall wooden posts, called the *vierkant*, surrounded by the living quarters, stables, and threshing floor. Being used for storing hay during the winter, the central square gave name to the building typology *haubarg* [German *Heu zu barge*].

The typology presumably came to Ejdersted from Holland in the 16th century and the building typology gradually became considered the culturally significant way to build (Pedersen, 2004, p.43). The owners of the Rothelau Farmhouse belonged to the elite of the Ejdersted population that was divided into four social groups: the large landowners, the smaller milk farmers, the workers, and the artisans (Pedersen, 2004, p.27). Being the largest contributors to





**Fig. 1** Rothelau Farmhouse, 1651. Photo: The Authors



**Fig. 2** Rothelau Farmhouse, 1651. Photo: The Authors

establishing and maintaining dikes, the largest landowners had control of the administration of the landscape. As such, it is impossible to imagine the Rothelau Farmhouse without both its geographic and administrative landscape

(Petersen, 2004). The Rothelau Farmhouse – today located at the Danish Open Air Museum – thus conveys the historically created material, political, and economic values, just as dikes, canals, and buildings may be understood as



**Fig. 3** Haubarg, 2022.  
Photo: Lars Rolfsted  
Mortensen




scenes of cultural meaning (Petersen, 2004, p.82).

According to Tim Ingold, landscape may be understood as a temporal process that is continuously transformed by activities, i.e., “perpetually under construction,” always “work in progress” (Ingold, 1993, p.162). Landscape not only comprises related elements and features, but likewise related activities or “tasks,” that are understood as constitutive acts of “dwelling” (Ingold, 1993, p.158). To Ingold, “landscape” is “continuously going on,” in the sense that hills, valleys, paths, tracks, trees, crops, buildings, and

people are understood as engaged in mutual “resonant” relations. As such, the materials, practices as well as the presence and character of landscape may be understood in a “dwelling perspective,” suggesting agency of the elements that constitute “landscape” through rhythmic interrelations (Ingold, 1993, p.160–164).

As with the relationship between the Rothelau Farmhouse and its geographic and administrative landscape, this perspective entails moving beyond a division of “inner and outer worlds,” “mind and matter,” “meaning and substance” (Ingold, 1993, p.154). Dwelling is, according to

253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278



**Fig. 4** Haubarg, 2022. Photo: The Authors

Ingold, “*with us, not against us*” as “land- scape” is understood as the lived involvement in a temporal world (Ingold, 1993, p.154). In this perspective, forms of buildings, landscapes and relations do not arise from nowhere, but “grow from the mutual involvement of people and materi- als” in an interweaving, that may soften a distinction between “artefacts and living things” (Ingold, 2000, p 339, 347). With functional, cultural, and historic signifi- cance and considered as a physical manifestation of lived involvement in a tem- poral world as dwelling, the (re)making of the Haubarg may thus be understood as a mean of *communication* through which cultural-historic values and meanings are conveyed.

### 3.2 Experiential Effects

From a distance, the Rothelau Farmhouse is characterised by a large, hipped roof, that sits on low, heavy set masonry walls elevated on a dwelling mound. The thatched roof expresses a softness in character, while also producing articulated edges with defined shadows at the footings. Entering through a low opening under the eaves, the interior space is dark, and one feels the uneven brick floor under- neath one’s feet. As one’s eyes adjust to the dim raking light, an

unexpected tall space, lit only by a single open- ing at the ridge of the roof is revealed. Entering this central space, a large loadbearing structure of squared timber posts becomes visi- ble. The structure is experienced as an upright, steady support to the tent like drape of the roof and produces an enclosure around which the walls are both per- meable and closed. Towards the living quarters, a double wall containing alcoves separates the residential spaces from the barn. On one side, the alcoves are sombre with a clear structural layering. On the other side, they are more elaborate, fin- ished in planed timber with painted sliding doors that are articulated by delicate profiles that catch the light.


From a distance, the (re)made Haubarg is characterised by a steep hipped timber roof, that extends to just above the ground, elevated on a dwelling mound. The roof is made of overlap- ping planed wood boards, that produce folds and tucks with distinct shadows, adding depth to the sharp figure. Entering through a low opening that protrudes outward above the terrain, the interior space is warm, and one feels how the structure lightly gives way under one’s feet. As one’s eyes ad- just to the flickering light coming through the loose-fit cladding, an unexpected tall space, articulated by a single pointed aperture at the ridge of the roof, is re- vealed. The space is made up from a clearly layered load bearing structure

306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335






**Fig. 5** Haubarg, 2022.  
Photo: The Authors



of rough sawn squared timbers. The upright, steady structure supports an inclined roof structure, in between which the entrance, the aperture and an alcove are located. Sitting down in the alcove, the delicate planed timber of the wooden lining feels soft to the touch, providing pause from the wealth of structural elements.

As the above phenomenological descriptions point out, the seemingly contradictory “ways of working” (Leatherbarrow, 2009) at play in the Rothelau Farmhouse – the settled and closed character of the building in relation to the open

march landscape, the stability and upright articulation of the timber structure against the enveloping drape of the roof, the opposition of ceiling heights, material finishes, sheen, mattness, softness, and sharpness of light – all contribute to the production of distinct bodily felt experiences which are re-interpreted in the Haubarg. To Hermann Schmitz, the body is conceived as the basis for human experience and philosophy defined as one’s contemplation of how one finds oneself in one’s surroundings (Schmitz, 2014, p.9). To Schmitz, *dwelling* is



**Fig. 6** Haubarg construction process, 2022. Photo: The Authors

understood as the *cultivation* of emotions in an enclosed space that may take place through the articulation of *suggestions of movement* and *synesthetic characters* which may be sensed on both one's own felt body and perceived in figures, whether static or in motion (Schmitz, 2016).

Suggestions of movement are signs of imminent movement, without actual movement, or gestures that go beyond the limit of movement, such as “the gait of a person;” “the space spanned by the rhythmic and tonal movement suggestions of the sound, such as piercing noise, diminishing echo, rising and falling, pressing and circling;” or the broadening and narrowing of space (Schmitz, 2012, p.4, 2). *Synesthetic characters* are qualities “which run through all specific senses and often, but not always, bear the names of specific sensory qualities,” (Schmitz, 2016, p.5) such as “the sharp, bright, gentle, pointed, hard, soft, warm, cold, heavy, compact, delicate, dense, smooth, the roughness of colours, sounds, smells, sound and silence, bouncing and trailing gait, joy, zeal, melancholy, freshness, and fatigue” (Schmitz, 2014, p.31).

In an architectural perspective, *embodied communication* may lead to “the formation of atmospheres of emotion” and to the “tuning of the occupants and/or visitors into these atmospheres” (Schmitz, 2016, p.15). As such, things, materials, and spaces may become bearers of

atmospheres of emotion so “that the person can attune to them in harmony with his *corporeal mood*” (Schmitz, 2016, p.14). This includes the experienced material qualities of e.g., the walls, the ceiling, and the floor, as well as the furnishing and control of incoming light, temperature, and sounds. In this perspective, the Haubarg may be understood as a new interpretation of a bodily experienced spatial sequence enacted between the closed and open, dark and light, matte and sharp that may be considered a mean of embodied *communication* as atmospheres through which experienced architectural meaning as dwelling may be conveyed.

### 3.3 Technical Properties

In the traditional Haubarg post-and-beam typology, the timber structure comprises four, sometimes six or even eight posts joined by longitudinal and transverse beams and stabilised by diagonal bracing, all structural elements joined with traditional wooden joints. Independent from the outer brick walls, the timber frame is resistant to the forces of nature, especially storm surges, just as it is protected from the weathering effects of the environment. The (re)making of the Haubarg is executed entirely in locally sourced Douglas fir. The



timber was provided by *Bondeskovgaard*, a 3rd generation sawmill established in 1900 which is located about 50 km from the building site. The sawmill combines inherited knowledge of timber with the use of modern machinery, securing a recourse-efficient use of the entire trunk. The timber was grown in Danish forests and sawed to specified dimensions as either rough or planed (PAR and PSE) lumber. In the building, the main structure comprises 3 modules of eight 5x5” timber posts in total, stabilised by diagonal bracing and leaving a rectangular 4x8 meter large floor-plan. The 4x5” roof rafters, supported by the timber frame and fitted with battens, are clad with overlapping planed wooden boards, that serve as a contemporary reference to the historic building's distinctive thatched roof. The entrance, alcove and skylight, constituting reinterpretations of three spatial situations identified in the historic Farmhouse, are made using 1” planed wooden boards, supported by a slender exterior structure.

Wood has been used as building material around the world for thousands of years and the technical properties of wood in historic buildings are well described. Not only is the molecular and cellular structure of wood fundamental to its use as a material well suited for building construction (Ramage et al., 2017), also the selection, processing, and treatment may be of critical importance as a way of craftsmanship to improve the properties of the material (Glarbo, 1959; Vadstrup, 2021). As a building material, wood has some very specific properties that are completely different from, for example, concrete or bricks. Thus, the opposition between the tectonic culture of the filigree *light* to the stereotomic culture of the *heavy* (Semper, 1989) is clearly articulated in the Rothelau Farmhouse as well as in the Haubarg. In addition to the structural effect, the timber structure – including diagonal bracing, battens, and cladding – makes visible the “[...] tectonic statement: the noble gesture which makes visible a play of forces, of load and support in column and entablature, calling forth our own empathetic participation in the experience” (Sekler, 1965, p.93).

Because unprotected structural timber is likely to be exposed to elevated levels of moisture, making it susceptible to fungal degradation, wood protection by design details such as raising the timber structure above ground level and providing overhanging roofs that limit the exposure to wetting and direct sunlight, may ensure that timber components can last, potentially for centuries (Ramage et al., 2017, p.351; Vestergaard, 2000). In addition to the geometrical configuration that limits exposure to wetting and shows water off, the clear tectonic articulation and layering – i.e., visually separating the structural timber frame, the secondary members, and the cladding – may allow the visitor an intuitive understanding of how the building is built as well as of the structural hierarchy and varying temporality of its “shearing layers” (Brand, 1995). As such, the structural configuration of the Haubarg may lead to an *engaging capacity* (Verbeek and Kockelkoren, 1998) that may support easy maintenance, selective replacement and intuitive repairs to the building over time.

Condensation of water around materials with high thermal conductivity – i.e., metal fastenings, nails, and bolts – may be considered ‘poisonous’ to timber structures and counteractive to material longevity (Vadstrup, 2021). Accordingly, the Haubarg is joined together without the use of modern steel fastenings, just as all nails used for cladding are made entirely out of wood. Only the ground screws are made of galvanised metal, reducing the carbon dioxide emission regarding the foundation (according to the manufacturer) by 89% compared to a contemporary concrete solution. In a detail perspective, the joints themselves may be understood as a minimal unit in the process of signification, as “[...] the 'construction' and the 'construing' of architecture are both in the detail” (Fracari, 1983, p.325). As such, the wooden joints have the double effect of connecting the individual structural members using durable wood-on-wood details as well as being the place where architectural meaning is created. The physical properties of the material itself, the processing, and



treatment, including the significant joint, the tectonic articulation and the static principle may thus be understood as a mean of *communication* through which material and technological qualities and meanings are conveyed.

### 3.4 (Re)making the Haubarg

As described and analysed above, the (re)making of the Haubarg has been extensively informed by crafts tradition and local vernacular as manifested in the historic Rothelau Farmhouse, both in terms of cultural-historical qualities, experiential effects, and technical properties. All three aspects are characterised by *communicating something*, both regarding the relation to the landscape, the spatial character as well as the physical material, inviting visitors to reflect on how they dwell. All in all, the Haubarg may be understood as the re-making of technical, cultural-historical, and experiential characteristics of the Rothelau Farmhouse conveying values, qualities, and meanings as dwelling.

## 4 Discussion and Conclusion

In light of the accelerating ecological crisis including sea level rise, extreme weather events and loss of biodiversity, all leading to higher mortality (Kemp et al., 2022) the question is how the cultural-historical qualities, experiential effects, and technical properties of a historic building, as described above, may become re-actualized as part of the development of (more) sustainable building culture(s).

The concept of sustainability was used for the first time in 1713 by Hans Carl von Carlowitz advocating the balancing of growth and harvest through the principles of rationalisation, substitution, and limitation as a reaction to the acute scarcity of timber caused by the heavy exploitation of forests by the mining industry. Even though contested, the most widely used definition of the concept of sustainability today, is the one offered by the Brundtland Commission Report defining sustainable development as

“development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (UN, 1987). In continuation, the sustainable development goals, SDGs “provides a shared blueprint for peace and prosperity for people and the planet, now and into the future” (UN SDGS, 2022). The (re)making of the Haubarg supports primarily SDG 11 (sustainable cities and communities), SDG 12 (responsible consumption and production) and SDG 15 (life on land). More specifically, the following targets may be identified: 11.4, strengthening efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural heritage; 11.c, building sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials; 12.2, sustainably managing and efficiently using of natural resources; 12.5, substantially reducing waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse and 15.2 sustainably managing of all types of forests and the halt of deforestation. As the project aims at inspiring a future sustainable building culture, SDG 3 (good health and well-being) may also be considered relevant. Similarly, SDG 4 (quality education) and SDG 13 (climate action) may be considered pertinent, as the project is part of a master program curriculum (UN SDGS, 2022). It is, however, important to underline, that even if individual goals have been identified, the SDGs should be considered in a holistic perspective since optimization at sector level will most likely fail as the individual sectors may compete with each other at the expense of the whole.

It has been argued that the SDGs prioritize economic growth over ecological integrity as they fail to monitor absolute trends in resource use (Eisenmenger et al., 2020). On a bounded planet, material resources are limited (Daly, 2007) and the safe operating space of numerous planetary boundaries are long exceeded (Rockström et al., 2009; Steffen et al., 2015; Raworth, 2012; 2018). In the construction industry, the concept of absolute environmental sustainability requires actions to respect the planetary boundaries and stay within the safe operating space (Hauschild et al., 2020). In this perspective, a sustainable building culture must prioritise the balancing between the just demand for welfare





among the living creatures and the bounded biophysical capital seen in a planetary perspective.

As a crucial part of the carbon cycle, wood accumulates and stores carbon dioxide while growing and acts as a carbon storage as long as it maintains its chemical form. When rotting or burned, carbon dioxide is released into the atmosphere again (Riebeek, 2011). As such, wood may be considered a renewable resource and potentially abundant, carbon neutral and recyclable. With recommended rotations for forestry harvests ranging from 35 to 70 years depending on species and location, wood – compared to mineral resources like rocks, ores and soils – has a very short geological timescale and may as such be considered the only widely used building material that is truly sustainable (Ramage et al. 2017, p.340). However – with an alternative response to climate mitigation and adaptation – the Climate Land Ambitions & Rights Alliance (Dooley et al., 2018) argues in favour of approaches that safeguard food security and food sovereignty, land rights, and biodiversity. According to this, major shifts in today's land use and land management is required – including end of deforestation, forest ecosystem restoration, natural forest expansion, agroforestry, improved management of forests for timber and reduction in wood production (Dooley et al., 2018).

Understanding the building as a physical manifestation of lived involvement in a temporal world as dwelling, the historic Rothelau Farmhouse as well as the experimental timber structure have been informed by a large number of parameters, including material, political, and economic values that may hold a number of potential sustainable potentials. The position of the building – protected from the sea by dikes and placed on top of a human made dwelling mound – may in itself become re-actualised as a necessary strategy in a near future with sea level rise and extreme weather events. The small size of the building may potentially inspire living on fewer square metres. In the building scale, traditional timber framing may be considered significantly more economical than the

contemporary massive CLT construction, regarding the amount of wood used. With the recommendation that wood be employed in products with a design lifespan that (at least) matches timber rotation periods (Ramage et al., 2017, p.351), wood utilization should move to longer-lived products (Dooley et al., 2018) and building longevity. In this perspective, the significant joint, the tectonic articulation and the static principle as means of empathic participation and conveyor of meaning has an engaging capacity that may potentially invite maintenance, reuse, refurbishment, and recycling, according to the principles of a circular economy (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2022).

One study investigating the value of building heritage concludes that in Denmark, listed buildings have a higher economic value than comparable not-listed buildings (Incentive, 2015) suggesting that architectural and cultural-historical qualities may have a positive influence on building lifespan. According to the European Environment Agency EEA, the ecological crisis is closely linked to economic growth, including increase in production, consumption, and resource use. It is pointed out, that 100% circularity is impossible, just as full decoupling of economic growth from environmental pressures and resource consumption is not possible. As such, a sustainable future requires change of qualitative aspects, such as consumption and social practices, not only a change of technology. As pointed out by EEA, “[w]hile the planet is finite in its biophysical sense, on a biophysically finite planet, infinite growth in human existential values, such as beauty, love, and kindness, as well as in ethics, may be possible” (EAA, 2021). In a cultural-historic perspective, vernacular building culture manifests an embodiment of both material and landscape conditions, cultivated by using the ability of a given society. This involvement in the temporal world may be described as a meaningful material practice where resources extracted from nature are deployed in a building system and cultivated to make *dwelling*.

From a phenomenological perspective, the fundamental existential structure indicating





how one feels is characterised by *attunement* [Befindlichkeit]. According to Heidegger, “[i]n attunement lies existentially a disclosive submission to world out of which things that matter to us can be encountered” (Heidegger, 1996, pp.129-130). As such, attunement makes it possible to direct oneself towards something, to be touched and have a sense for something. The making as disclosure of landscape characteristics, material qualities and static principle experienced through embodied communication through which architectural meaning as dwelling is conveyed may thus potentially invite “[...] staying with things for a longer while” (Andersen, 2022, p.335). In this perspective, it may be argued that longevity seen from both a technical, cultural-historical and experiential perspective is dependent on “[...] maintaining and reinforcing the meanings in an object” (Muñoz Viñas, 2005) that may potentially contribute to a resource-saving strategy and sustainable development by ensuring maximum meaning for present and future generations.

In continuation of the above, it is recommended, that sustainable design strategies include material parameters that may enhance the engaging capacity such as the selection, processing and treatment, wood-on-wood joints, wood protection by design, separation of temporal layers, clear tectonic articulation and structural configuration; environmental parameters that may enhance the sense of interrelation, such as administration, geography, topography, ground, vegetation, weather and climate conditions; and spatial parameters that may enhance emotional attachment such as bodily experienced spatial sequence enacted between the closed and open, dark and light, matte and sharp. All parameters are conveying meaning through communication and may as such highlight the lived involvement and the capacity for maintenance and care that may support building longevity.

It may be concluded that technical properties, cultural-historical qualities, and experiential effects as found in crafts tradition and local vernacular, as in the case of *The Rothelau Farmhouse*, may inform a contemporary design

practice, exemplified in the specific case of (re)making the Haubarg. Architecture should not be understood as a building in and of itself, but rather as situated in a larger material, environmental, and social (eco)system. As reduction in wood production is required in order to safeguard food security and sovereignty, land rights, and biodiversity, a holistic approach including building longevity should be observed. Made with a potential abundant, carbon neutral and recyclable bio-based material (if used correctly) and as conveyer of technical, cultural-historical, and experiential values, qualities and meaning, the (re)making of the Haubarg may supplement and qualify contemporary sustainable design strategies. As *embodied communication* through which meanings as *dwelling* are conveyed, the (re)making of the Haubarg may thus inspire future (more) sustainable building culture(s) in careful consideration of the biophysically bounded Earth.

**Acknowledgements** This paper is a part of the research project “Where We Live, Now, Then and in the Future” which is conducted in collaboration with the Danish Open Air Museum and Roskilde University (RUC) with financial support from the Velux Foundation. Ground screws were generously sponsored by Fremtidens Fundament ApS and wooden nails by BECK Fastening.

## References

- Andersen NB. Beauty Reclaimed – Towards an Ontology of Sustainable Architecture and Design. In: Warda J, editor. Beyond Bauhaus. New Approaches to Architecture and Design Theory. Heidelberg: Arthistoricum; 2020. p. 203–214
- Andersen NB (2018) Phenomenological Method - Towards an approach to architectural investigation, description and design. In: Lorentsen E, Torp KA (eds) Formation - Architectural Education in a Nordic Perspective. Architectural Publisher B, Copenhagen, pp 74–95
- Brand S (1995) How Buildings Learn: What Happens After They're Built. Penguin Books, London
- Brejtnrod KN, Kalbar P, Petersen S, Birkved M (2017) The absolute environmental performance of buildings. Build Environ 119:87–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.build-env.2017.04.003>
- Daly H (2007) Ecological Economics and Sustainable Development, Selected Essays of Herman Daly. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham



- Dooley K et al. Missing Pathways to 1.5°C: The role of the land sector in ambitious climate action. *Climate Land Ambition and Rights Alliance*; 2018
- Eisenmenger et al (2020) The Sustainable Development Goals prioritize economic growth over sustainable resource use. *Sustain Sci* 15:1101–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00813-x>
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation: Let's build a circular economy. <https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/> (2022). Accessed 3 October 2022
- European Commission: Energy performance of buildings. <https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/energy-efficiency/energy-performance-of-buildings> (2021). Accessed 3 October 2022
- Frascardi M. The Tell-The-Tale Detail. In: Deely, JN, Lenhart, MD, editors. *Semiotics 1981*. Boston, MA: Springer; 1983. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-9328-7\\_32](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-9328-7_32)
- Glarbo O. Træ. København: Teknisk Forlag; 1959
- Groat LN, Wang D (2013) *Architectural Research Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken
- Hauschild MZ, Kara S, Røpke I. Absolute sustainability: Challenges to life cycle engineering. *CIRP annals*, 69 (2), 533–553 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cirp.2020.05.004>
- Heidegger, M. *Being and Time*. Albany: State University of New York Press; 1996
- ICOMOS Climate Change and Cultural Heritage Working Group (2019) *The Future of Our Past: Engaging Cultural Heritage in Climate Action*. ICOMOS, Paris, p 2019
- Incentive (2015) Værdien af Bygningsarven. <https://realdania.dk/publikationer/faglige-publikationer/v%C3%A6rdien-af-bygningsarv>. Accessed 3 October 2022
- Ingold T (1993) The Temporality of the Landscape. *World Archaeol* 25(2):152–174
- Ingold T (2000) *The Perception of the Environment*. Routledge, London
- IPCC (2022) *Climate Change 2022. Mitigation of Climate Change*. [https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC\\_AR6\\_WGIII\\_Full\\_Report.pdf](https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_Full_Report.pdf). Accessed 3 October 2022
- Julebæk VB (2022) Making Matters – the scope of material effects in the transformation of architectural environments. In: *Stof og Virkning* (pre-print). Dissertation, Royal Danish Academy – Architecture, p 337–471.
- Kemp L et al. Climate Endgame: Exploring catastrophic climate change scenarios. *PNAS* Vol. 119 | No. 34. 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2108146119>
- Leatherbarrow D (2009) *Architecture Oriented Otherwise*. Princeton Architectural Press, New York
- Muñoz Viñas S. *Contemporary Theory of Conservation*. Oxford: Elsevier; 2005
- Pedersen MV. Ejdersted. København: Frilandsmuseet; 2004
- Ramage et al. The wood from the trees: The use of timber in construction. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* Volume 68, Part 1, February 2017; 333–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.09.107>
- Raworth K. *A Safe and Just Space for Humanity*. 2012. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/safe-and-just-space-humanity>. Accessed 3 October 2022
- Raworth K (2018) *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. Cornerstone, New Orleans
- Riebeek H. *The Carbon Cycle*. 2011. <https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/features/CarbonCycle>. Accessed 3 October 2022
- Rockström J, Steffen W, Noone K et al (2009) A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature* 461:472–475. <https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a>
- Schmitz H. *Atmospheric Spaces. Ambiances*. 2016. <https://journals.openedition.org/ambiances/711>
- Schmitz H (2014) Kort indføring i den nye fænomenologi. Aalborg Universitetsforlag, Aalborg
- Schmitz H. *New Phenomenology. A brief introduction*. Milan: Mimesis International; 2019
- Schön D. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers; 1986
- Schön D. *The Reflective Practitioner – How Professionals Think in Action*. Århus: Klim; 2001
- Semper G (1989) *The Four Elements of Architecture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Sekler EF (1965) *Structure, Construction, Tectonics*. In: Kepes G (ed) *Structure in Art and Science*. G. Braziller, New York, pp 89–95
- Steffen W, Richardson K, Rockström J, et al. Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. Vol 347, Issue 6223. 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855>
- UN (1987) *Our Common Future*. United Nations. <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>. Accessed 3 October 2022
- UN FCCC (2015) *The Paris Agreement*. United Nations. [https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english\\_paris\\_agreement.pdf](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf). Accessed 3 October 2022
- UN SDGs (2022) *Sustainable Development Goals*. United Nations. <https://sdgs.un.org>. Accessed 18 Sept 2022.
- Vadstrup S (2021). *Nye bæredygtige træhuse – helt af TRÆ, med vedvarende holdbarhed 2019 – 2021*. Søren Vadstrup. <https://www.bevardithus.dk/wp-content/uploads/Nye-traehuse-helt-af-trae-dec-2021-Kopi.pdf>. Accessed 3 October 2022
- Verbeek PP, Kockelkoren P (1998) *The Things That Matter*. *Des Issues* 14(3):28–42. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1511892>
- Vestergaard M. *Dokumentation af konstruktiv træbeskyttelse*. Miljøprojekt Nr. 515. Teknologisk Institut. 2000