

Concepts of Hybridity in Residential Architecture

Kosta Stojanović

Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

kostastojanovic1@gmail.com, ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0009-0000-4017-4548>

Abstract: In contemporary architectural discourse, multifamily housing requires a fundamental redefinition. Traditional divisions between dwelling, work, and public life no longer reflect the complexity of modern living. This paper explores hybridity in residential architecture, not as a simple blend of typologies, but as the spatial ability to adapt through transformability, ambiguity, and ambivalence. A hybrid apartment, in this defined context, is a spatial entity that does not have a firmly defined program, but enables different usage scenarios - an apartment as a workspace, a public microspace, a place of collectivity, but also of individuality.

The research relies on a theoretical framework that includes concepts of flexibility, typological mutations, as well as philosophical approaches to space as an unfixed field of potential. In this context, the apartment is seen as a space of possibilities, where it is important how the space is used, not how it was initially designed. The paper analyzes examples from different urban environments, from experimental housing models to adapted spaces within the existing housing market, in which the boundaries between private and public, work and housing, fixed and variable are almost erased.

Through a critical analysis of spatial models that support multifunctionality, the paper asks the question: is it possible to redefine housing typology not as a final form, but as a processual platform for everyday life? In this framework, the hybrid apartment becomes a paradigm of modern housing, an apartment that not only has the ability to adapt, but also the potential to actively participate in shaping a new culture of life, work and community. In the end, this paper aims to map new criteria for designing apartments that go beyond functionalist patterns, introducing the dimension of spatial indeterminacy as a basis for generating long-term relevance and social sustainability in housing architecture.

Keywords: hybridity, housing, spatial flexibility, typological mutation, architectural design

1 Introduction

In the today's contemporary architectural discourse, the concept of apartment shows clear limits of its historical typification. The traditional model of rigid division into separate functional units or zones like for sleeping, working, preparing food and resting was created in the context of industrial society and was based on the assumption that life, work and public participation take place in clearly separated spatial domains. Such approach corresponded to the social and economic framework of modernism, when the stability of the workplace and the role of the home as a refuge were unquestionable. However, globalization, accelerated transformations of everyday life and shifts in the organization of work have shown that this concept no longer corresponds to real patterns of space use. The digitization of work and the rise of working from home are blurring the line between private and professional life, while the affordable housing crisis is challenging traditional patterns of ownership and use.

In addition to socio-economic shifts, architectural practice is increasingly influenced by environmental factors. Climate change and growing energy efficiency issues require new design strategies that go beyond standard functionalist matrices. Instead of self-sufficient housing units closed within themselves, models that introduce collective resources and shared spaces are gaining more and more importance. The resurgence of shared practices like from shared workshops and kitchens to cooperative models of ownership are indicating that the apartment can no longer be understood as an isolated unit, but as part of a wider network of spatial and social relations.

This paper starts from the assumption that multi-family housing should not be viewed as a typologically pre-fixed form, but as an open field of possibilities. In this sense, the apartment is not understood as a final and pre-closed product, but as a procedural platform that enables the accommodation of different scenes of life - from the intimacy of privacy to the intensity of collectivity, from introspective retreat to the dynamics of encounters and joint creation. Such a perspective implies fluidity, transformability and spatial reinterpretation in accordance with changing living conditions, social practices and technological innovations (Bettaieb, 2023).

It is important to emphasize that the idea of hybridity in housing is not completely new. Even during the sixties of the last century, avant-garde architectural experiments emphasized the potential of intertwining the individual and the collective. The most famous example is Habitat 67 in Montreal (Moshe Safdie), where the concept of "house with garden" is reinterpreted into a multi-family matrix through the idea of "garden at height". This project

showed how an individual ideal can be transposed into a collective structure, simultaneously opening up new social and spatial dynamics. Similar tendencies appeared in the experimental projects of metabolist architects in Japan, who treated housing as an open system capable of growth and transformation (Tamari, 2014).

Today's socio-economic and ecological context, however, gives the concept of hybridity a new weight and a different logic. While the previous decades were marked by formal innovations and typological experiments, contemporary architectural discourse emphasizes open and adaptive systems that develop together with users. Hybridity can therefore not only be seen as a combination of different functions or typologies, but as a process of constant negotiation between space and life, between the designed and the inhabited. Such a paradigm requires that the apartment is not designed as a predefined outcome, but as a space of open possibilities, capable of responding to changing social and environmental challenges over a longer time horizon.

2 Research methodology

The methodological framework for this work is based on a qualitative approach, because it enables a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of hybridity in housing and its socio-spatial implications. Unlike quantitative models that strive for universalization, qualitative methodology opens up space for interpretation and contextualization of architectural practices. This approach is particularly suitable when exploring concepts such as flexibility, typological mutation or spatial ambivalence, because they are not always easily measurable, but require interpretation through the analysis of experiences, intentions and narratives related to housing (Cellucci, 2015). In her study on flexible housing, Cellucci emphasizes the need for adaptable spatial configurations that respond to changing social and functional requirements, proposing design strategies that view housing as an open, evolving system shaped by users' practices and everyday life.

The first segment of the methodology refers to the literature review, the aim of which is to map the historical and theoretical development of the idea of hybridity in architecture. Key periods are analyzed - from modernist experiments such as Le Corbusier's housing units, through postmodern typological mutations, to contemporary cooperative and participatory housing models. In this way, the theoretical framework of the research is established and the concept of hybridity is more precisely defined, which is further used as a starting category for the analysis of case studies. This methodological step is based on the principles of theoretical sampling, where literature is not viewed as a passive background, but as an active resource for the interpretation of contemporary architectural phenomena (Al Braifkani & Günçe, 2025).

The second segment of the methodology involves the analysis of case studies. Selected examples of multi-family housing in the European context include projects that demonstrate different approaches to typological innovation, spatial flexibility and the organization of communal living. The case study method allows complex concepts to be seen through concrete spatial and social dynamics, thus establishing a bridge between the theoretical and the practical in a clear way. The analysis does not only include architectural features such as spatial disposition and typological solutions, but also includes phenomenological aspects, i.e. the way users perceive and shape space. This expands the methodological framework beyond formal architectural criticism, including the dimensions of everyday life and subjective experiences.

The third segment refers to the comparative analysis of selected examples. Different models of hybridity and their implications for contemporary housing practices are examined through comparison. For example, projects that integrate common spaces into the structure of the building are compared to those that introduce flexible typological matrices at the apartment level. This methodological strategy makes it possible to observe broader patterns, but also to emphasize the specificity of each individual case (De Jorge-Huertas, 2018).

By combining theoretical analysis and empirical examples, the methodology of this work enables the perception of hybridity in residential architecture simultaneously through a conceptual definition and through concrete practices. The qualitative research framework, based on case studies and phenomenological analysis, enables not only the identification of spatial characteristics, but also the understanding of how hybrid spaces shape the daily experience of housing and open up opportunities for redefining the typology of the apartment in contemporary society.

3 Theoretical framework

In contemporary architectural discourse, the concept of hybridity is often reduced to a simple combination of different programs and typologies in one building - a market with housing, offices with housing or other typological combinations. However, such understanding remains superficial, because hybridity is not just a sum

of functions but a transformation of the logic of space. In the context of multi-family housing, the focus must shift from the building as collection field to the apartment as platform, a unit that is able to change its own internal organization and functional regimes. This shift opens up space to define hybridity not as a fixed typological innovation, but as a dynamic process that follows the changes of everyday life.

Three lines of thoughts are crucial in establishing the theoretical framework. The first relies on Henri Lefebvre and his understanding of space as a social product. According to Lefebvre, space cannot be reduced to a neutral stage; it always reflects and produces social relations and practices. The apartment, as the basic housing unit, is therefore not a static framework of life, but a field of constant negotiation that changes in accordance with social transformations (Erman, 2019). In this key, the hybrid apartment can be understood as a space of open potential, shaped as much by the project as by the practice of the occupants.

Another line of thought is related to architectural theories that explicitly articulated hybridity as a design category. Bernard Tschumi, through the idea of cross-programming, showed that space can generate new typologies precisely through the interweaving and collision of functions. In the *Delirious New York* manifesto and later projects, Rem Koolhaas promoted the hybrid building as the basic form of the modern city, where the differences between public and private, economic and cultural are erased in complex spatial matrices. Stan Allen further developed the idea of field conditions, organizations that are not closed in advance, but enable change and transformation over time (Allen, 2012). These contributions indicate that hybridity in architecture is not only about addition, but also about the potential of space to produce unexpected modes of use.

The third line of thought can be connected to the philosophical concepts, especially with Bergson's idea of duration (*durée*). Duration emphasizes the open time dimension of space and questions the understanding of architecture as a static form. In this context, space is understood as a state that changes faster and more flexibly than material construction. The apartment thus becomes a choreography of changes, a platform that does not define patterns of use in advance, but enables them (Borradori, 2011).

At the intersection of these lines of thought stands the notion of a hybrid apartment. It is a space determined less by what it "is" in advance, and more by what it "can be" - polyvalent, transformable and open to temporary modes of use. Such an apartment should not be viewed as a closed typological unit, but as a process in which social relations, theoretical anticipation and spatial experimentation are intertwined. Thus, the theoretical framework of this research makes it possible to see hybridity in residential architecture not only as a typological innovation, but also as an ontological change in the understanding of space - from a stable object to a dynamic field of possibilities.

4 Defining the hybridity

Hybridity in the architecture of multi-family housing cannot be reduced to a simple sum of different functions within a single building, such as apartment blocks with commercial ground floors or skyscrapers combining offices and apartments. Such interpretation remains superficial because hybridity is not a simple collage of programs, but a transformation of the very logic of space and the way it enables, directs and produces life scenarios. In this paper, hybridity is understood as the ability of a residential unit and its immediate environment to host multiple, successive and simultaneously changeable modes of life, without losing spatial readability and comfort. In other words, hybridity represents a shift from typologically predetermined rooms as functional entities to the idea of an apartment as an open platform, a flexible framework in which everyday life is constantly negotiated, transformed and re-established.

Historically speaking, the idea of hybridity in architecture has its roots in the theories of John Habraken, who developed the concept of "Supports" in the 1960s. He was the first to clearly differentiate the permanent elements of a building - the structure and infrastructure - from the variable layers, the so-called "infill", which users can change according to their own needs. This theory brought into architecture the idea that the apartment does not have to be definitively defined at the moment of construction, but that it can remain an open system capable of continuous adaptation (Habraken, 2008). This line was followed by Jeremy Till and Tatjana Schneider in *Flexible Housing* (2007), where they define housing as a framework that must anticipate the unforeseen - architecture that does not impose unequivocal patterns of life, but allows users to develop their own configurations of space (Schneider & Till, 2016).

These theoretical contributions made it possible to understand hybridity not only as a spatial, but also as a social and phenomenological category. At the level of the apartment, it implies the transition from predefined rooms to flexible scenes of life. The living room, which in the modernist typology was conceived as a central place for

family gathering, in a hybrid apartment can become an improvised studio, a space for working from home, a cinema hall or a meditation zone. The kitchen island can simultaneously function as a work surface, a place to prepare food and a table for shared meals. Such polyvalence does not arise by chance, but requires specific spatial and technical predispositions: neutral spans of the structure that allow the free movement of partitions, modular furniture that can be used in multiple ways, sliding and rotating elements that change the proportions of the space, as well as pre-prepared installation connections that support different functional scenarios.

At the level of a residential building or complex, hybridity manifests itself through the introduction of common spaces that relieve individual apartments from the need for each rare function to have its own dedicated room. Guest rooms, shared laundry rooms, coworking spaces, studios, winter gardens and workshops become an extension of the daily life of the tenants. This introduces the logic of collective capacities: what is too expensive or spatially inefficient for an individual household becomes available through shared resources. Projects such as the works of Lacaton & Vassal clearly demonstrate that increasing the quality of life in multi-family housing does not necessarily mean increasing square footage, but rather opening up space for different modes of use and introducing new levels of flexibility into the collective framework. This approach is increasingly becoming a sustainability strategy because it allows housing to remain relevant over a long period of time and to adapt to demographic and economic changes without expensive construction interventions.

Phenomenologically, hybridity in housing changes the experience of everyday life. It creates conditions in which space is no longer a predetermined framework of behavior, but a stage on which everyday life is improvised and constantly redefined. This erases the rigid boundaries between private and public, work and rest, individual and collective. Users become active co-authors of the space, and the apartment turns into a field of negotiation between architecture and everyday life. Recent research shows that such flexible domestic environments, especially in small-scale housing, empower families to develop unique rituals and adaptive spatial practices outside conventional typological constraints (Costa Santos et al.).

The technological and social context further intensify the need for hybridity. The digitization of work and the rise of working from home have made the apartment turn into a complex platform that has to host multiple functions: an office, a classroom, a space for rest and a space for socialization. At the same time, climate changes and the rising price of square meters make every square meter unit valuable, so the rational use of space is imposed as an economic and ecological imperative. In this sense, hybridity ceases to be a luxury and becomes a necessity: it is a response to the simultaneous pressures of economy, ecology and everyday life, allowing spatial comfort to be combined with collective resources and sustainability.

Based on these insights, hybridity is defined in this research as the ability of the apartment and its immediate environment to support multiple scenarios of use through spatial flexibility, typological adaptability and social openness, while not losing legibility, comfort and sustainability. A hybrid apartment is not a closed typological unit, but a processual entity: it is not determined by what it "is", but by what it "can become". Its value does not lie in its stable form, but in its capacity for change, in its ability to host different forms of life, work and community over time. In this way, the hybrid apartment overcomes the dichotomy of individual and collective, private and public, designed and inhabited, offering a vision of housing as an open field of potential where architecture and life constantly intertwine and shape each other.

5 Case studies

This paper analyzes three case studies that illustrate different approaches to understanding and implementing hybridity in multi-family housing. The selection was guided by three criteria aligned with the theoretical framework. First, all projects belong to recent multi-family architecture, where flexibility, collectivity, and spatial transformability are particularly emphasized. Second, each case exhibits key features of hybridity - support for multiple use scenarios, shared spaces that relieve private units, and potential for typological innovation or adaptation. Third, all are located in Europe, ensuring comparability within similar socio-economic and climate contexts.

The first example is Mehr als Wohnen in Zurich (2015), one of the largest cooperative housing developments in Europe, with over 1,200 units across 13 buildings. Designed by multiple architectural firms, the project blends private living with a rich array of communal spaces, including coworking hubs, workshops, kindergartens, cultural venues, and roof gardens. These shared facilities reduce the functional burden on individual apartments and encourage collective life. The project demonstrates how hybridity can be achieved at scale, supported by cooperative ownership and participatory governance ([Hugentobler et al., 2015]).

The second case, Tour Bois-le-Prêtre in Paris (2011), designed by Lacaton & Vassal with Frédéric Druot and Jean-Philippe Hutin, rethinks a 1960s social housing tower through adaptive reuse. Rather than demolishing the building, the architects added prefabricated winter gardens and balconies, enriching each unit and enabling new modes of occupation. Apartments became flexible zones—semi-public during the day, private at night—exemplifying how hybridity can be introduced into existing housing stock while preserving social fabric and promoting sustainability.

The third example is R50 Cohousing in Berlin (2013), a participatory project designed by Heide & von Beckerath, ifau, and Jesko Fezer. Developed in direct collaboration with future residents, the project features 19 flexible units and diverse shared spaces, including a kitchen, garden, workshops, and community rooms. Apartments are minimally divided and based on open structural spans, allowing continuous reinterpretation. Hybridity here is not only spatial but procedural, emerging from the collaborative design process.

Together, these cases present hybridity as a flexible framework, ranging from institutional to grassroots strategies. They challenge the apartment as a fixed form and affirm housing as an evolving platform for shared life, adaptability, and long-term sustainability.

5.1 Case Study 1: More than Housing (Mehr als Wohnen), Zurich

The Mehr als Wohnen project, completed in 2015 in Zurich, is a leading example of contemporary cooperative housing in Europe. Initiated through an international competition and realized by 13 architectural bureaus, it comprises over 1,200 residential units across 13 buildings. Grounded in principles of collective ownership and cooperative management, the project aims to redefine housing by focusing not just on individual apartments, but on community, daily life, and the urban experience.

Its essence lies in a hybrid approach, blending private and shared spaces into an integrated living system. The inclusion of coworking areas, workshops, kindergartens, cultural spaces, roof gardens, and shared kitchens reduces pressure on private apartments and promotes the collective use of resources. As a result, housing becomes a flexible network of shared spaces activated by community needs.

A key site within the project is the Hunziker Areal, where two notable buildings—House A (Cluster House) and House M (Housing Community) designed by Duplex Architekten, illustrate this model. Instead of typical block layouts, the masterplan arranges compact buildings around a network of streets, squares, and open spaces with a strong urban character. Ground floors host public functions like restaurants, shops, and workshops, enhancing street life and social interaction.

"House A" introduces the cluster apartment model, where several small private units share large communal areas for cooking, dining, and socializing. Each unit still includes a bathroom and kitchenette, ensuring privacy within community living. This layout supports more efficient use of space, lower costs, and adaptable lifestyles.



Figure 1: project floor plan (in white private areas, in yellow shared areas)

Despite its success, the project faces challenges. Managing extensive shared facilities requires strong organization and consistent tenant engagement, which may not be sustainable in the long term. In regions without a strong cooperative culture, the model may face resistance or passivity. Additionally, although designed to be inclusive, high construction and maintenance standards can make it less affordable to lower-income groups.

Overall, Mehr als Wohnen and the Hunziker Areal present a compelling vision for 21st-century housing—urban, flexible, and community-focused. It demonstrates that housing can extend beyond function, fostering social sustainability and shared life. Yet, it also raises critical questions about scalability, management, and the shift from housing as private commodity to collective urban infrastructure.

5.2 Case study 2: Transformation of Tour Bois-le-Prêtre, Paris

The Transformation of Tour Bois-le-Prêtre, completed in 2011, is the work of Anne Lacaton and Jean-Philippe Vassal, in collaboration with Frédéric Druot and Jean-Philippe Hutin. The project involved transforming a 1960s social housing tower in northern Paris. Rather than demolishing the building and displacing residents, the team revitalized it through architectural intervention by adding winter gardens, balconies, and expanded spaces that enriched tenants' daily lives. It stands today as a widely cited example of combining sustainability, social equity, and spatial innovation.

The project's greatest strength lies in its social and ecological logic. By opting for renovation over demolition, the community's social fabric was preserved, and major environmental costs were avoided. No new materials were needed, and no construction waste generated. The new additions, conservatories and terraces, created flexible zones adaptable as gardens, living extensions, workspaces, or social areas. This transformed static apartments into hybrid platforms, responsive to seasonal and family needs. Renovation costs were also significantly lower than new construction, and crucially, tenants remained in place during the works.

However, the project is not without challenges. The added architectural layers, while offering spatial richness, require ongoing technical maintenance and management, which could become difficult over time. Questions remain regarding long-term energy performance, especially concerning heating and cooling the new spaces. Furthermore, while the intervention improved the building's spatial and social dimensions, it didn't resolve structural economic issues like rising rents and limited affordability - challenges that extend beyond architecture alone. Some critics also note the limited transferability of this model, which relies heavily on specific political, financial, and cultural conditions.



Figure 2: project floor plan (old vs the new floor plan)

The Bois-le-Prêtre transformation is a landmark case of hybrid housing through adaptive reuse. Its lasting value is the demonstration that architecture can build upon existing structures to create transformable, human-centered environments without displacement. Yet, it also underscores that spatial hybridity needs supporting systems: maintenance strategies, inclusive policies, and long-term housing solutions. As such, the project stands as both a manifesto and a caution, revealing the potential and the constraints of hybrid architecture in today's urban realities.

5.3 Case Study 3: R50 Cohousing, Berlin

The R50 Cohousing project, completed in 2013 in Berlin's Kreuzberg district, is one of the most recognized examples of contemporary participatory and hybrid multi-family housing. Designed by ifau und Jesko Fezer and Heide & von Beckerath, the project was developed closely with future residents. It includes 19 apartments arranged around a central core with open communications. The project's value lies in its cooperative ownership model, flexible housing typologies, and diverse common spaces, fostering a new housing culture beyond traditional individual ownership.

A key strength of R50 is its participatory process. Residents were involved from the beginning, shaping spaces to fit their lifestyles. Shared areas—a large kitchen and dining room, workshops, garden, and meeting rooms—support collective living and reduce the need for oversized private units. Apartments feature neutral structural spans and minimal partitions, enabling varied layouts and later adjustments. This reflects hybridity: housing not as a fixed type, but an adaptable framework. Economically, the cooperative model reduced costs and avoided real estate speculation, making the project more affordable than typical market offerings.

Despite its innovation, R50 has limitations. The participatory process, while democratic, required significant time, commitment, and financial stability—conditions not accessible to all. Participation assumes a willingness for collective decision-making, potentially excluding more vulnerable or less stable populations. Moreover, while the architecture is flexible, the building's small scale raises questions about whether this model can succeed on a larger level without losing its quality of communal relationships. Critics also note that such projects, though progressive, often attract well-educated, economically secure groups rather than those in greatest need.

R50 stands out as a hybrid model where private and communal life merge into a unified spatial and social system. Its participatory design and flexible typologies offer long-term adaptability. However, the project highlights broader issues of inclusivity and scalability. Can such models apply across different urban contexts and reach wider populations? While challenges remain, R50 is a landmark in contemporary cohousing—proof that hybridity is more than a spatial solution; it is a socio-political tool for reimagining how we live.

6 Discussion

The analysis of three case studies clearly shows that hybridity in multi-family housing is not a one-size-fits-all concept, but a spectrum of possibilities that manifest through different spatial, typological and social strategies. The projects Mehr als Wohnen in Zurich, Tour Bois-le-Prêtre in Paris and R50 Cohousing in Berlin, although different in context and scope, all confirm the basic thesis of the work: the apartment should not be seen as a final typological form, but as a processual platform open to transformations.

In the case of Mehr als Wohnen, hybridity is realized through a large scale and institutional framework. The project shows how collective ownership and diverse common spaces can relieve private units and create new patterns of everyday life. Its strength lies in the fact that housing transcends the private sphere and becomes part of the urban ecosystem. However, this very scale imposes complex management and high costs, which raises the question of whether the model can be transferred outside the Swiss context, where the culture of cooperatives and the financial strength of communities have a long tradition.

Tour Bois-le-Prêtre demonstrates another dimension of hybridity – one that arises through the adaptation of existing stock. By adding conservatories and balconies, the apartments gain new spatial layers and flexible modes of use, thus redefining everyday life without demolition and mass displacement. This project shows that hybridity is not necessarily related to new typological experiments, but that it can also be a strategy of sustainability and social justice. However, the limitations are obvious: high technical standards and potential maintenance problems raise the question of the long-term sustainability of such interventions, especially in a social context where tenants' financial resources may be limited.

The third example, R50 Cohousing, introduces hybridity through a participatory and experimental approach. Here, the private and the common intertwine through flexible apartments and a rich spectrum of shared spaces, while the architecture itself remains open to change. The strength of the project is in the democratization of the process and in the economic model that opposes market speculation. However, its weakness lies in its limited inclusiveness – participation and financial contribution require resources and stability that are not available to everyone, so such models often attract specific social groups. Also, the question of scalability arises: can the participatory model maintain quality in larger projects, or would it lose the immediacy and cohesion of the community?

When these examples are viewed together, three distinct modes of hybridity can be discerned. The first is hybridity on a large scale, institutionally supported and directed towards the creation of an urban community (Mehr als Wohnen). The second is hybridity through transformation, which revitalizes the existing stock and introduces new spatial possibilities within the framework of the old structure (Tour Bois-le-Prêtre). The third is hybridity through participation, where users become co-authors of the space, shaping it according to their own needs (R50 Cohousing). This diversity confirms that hybridity is not a universal recipe, but a framework within which different architectural practices can be developed depending on the context, resources and goals.

What all three examples have in common is that they go beyond a functionalist approach to housing. Instead of defining the apartment through predetermined programs, they see it as an open field of potential that users shape over time. At the same time, all projects show the limits of hybridity: the need for complex management, the risk of limited inclusivity, the challenges of long-term maintenance and the dependence on a specific economic and political framework. These very limits indicate that hybridity should not be romanticized as an ideal solution, but understood as a process of negotiation between space, life and social structures.

In other words, the hybrid apartment and hybrid building do not offer ready-made solutions, but rather new frameworks of possibilities. Their value lies not in perfection, but in their capacity to change, adapt and respond to social, environmental and technological challenges. It is precisely in this openness and imperfection that the potential to redefine residential architecture in the 21st century lies.

7 Conclusion

This research showed that hybridity in residential architecture is not just the result of combining different functions within one building, but that it is about a deep transformation of the way the apartment and housing should be understood. The traditional model of rigid typology - with clearly demarcated functional units and stable patterns of use - has proven to be insufficient in the contemporary socio-economic and ecological context. Globalization, digitization of work, climate change and the growing crisis of affordable housing demand new answers from architecture, and hybridity is emerging as a key concept in this context.

The analyzed case studies – Mehr als Wohnen in Zurich, Tour Bois-le-Prêtre in Paris and R50 Cohousing in Berlin – clearly showed that hybridity can take different forms depending on the context and goals. In the first example, it is manifested on a large scale through an institutionally supported cooperative model with a rich spectrum of shared spaces. In the second, hybridity arises through the transformation of the existing stock and the introduction of new spatial layers that extend the life of the building and enrich housing without demolition. In the third, hybridity is developed through a participatory process, where tenants become co-authors of the space

and where flexibility is realized through minimal typological determinism. Despite the differences, all the examples confirm that the apartment should be seen as a processual entity and not as a final product.

Critical analysis also showed that hybridity is not without its challenges. The complexity of managing common spaces, the potential problems of long-term maintenance, the risk of limited inclusivity and the dependence on specific economic and political conditions indicate that hybrid models cannot be simply transferred to every context. They require not only architectural innovation, but also institutional, cultural and social changes that enable participation, shared governance and long-term sustainability.

Despite these limitations, hybridity opens up the possibility of redefining the design criteria of residential architecture. Instead of stable typological matrices, the following come to the fore:

- spatial flexibility: neutral constructions, modular elements, the possibility of space transformation over time;
- collective resources: common spaces that relieve private units and create a new housing culture;
- user participation: inclusion of tenants in the design and management process;
- sustainability: rational use of resources, extending the life of buildings and reducing the ecological footprint.

In this way, hybridity is not only a spatial strategy, but also a social and political instrument for shaping new forms of community and fairer access to housing. The hybrid apartment becomes a paradigm of modern housing precisely because it is not closed in on itself, but opens up to future possibilities and needs that have yet to arise. Its value does not lie in a fixed form, but in the ability to change and to actively participate in the creation of a new culture of life, work and shared living.

In the end, we can say that hybridity can become the main criteria or desired value when designing apartments in the 21st century. It goes beyond functionalist patterns and introduces the dimension of spatial indeterminacy as a basis for long-term relevance and social sustainability. In this sense, the redefinition of housing typology should not be seen as the end of the process, but as its beginning, that is, an open platform that allows architecture and life to continue to shape each other in a dynamic dialogue.

Acknowledgments: The article was realized with the support of the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia through the scholarship awarded in 2025.

References:

- Allen S. *Points + Lines: Diagrams and Projects for the City*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press; 1999.
- Erman T. From informal housing to apartment housing: exploring the “new social” in a gecekondu rehousing project, Turkey. *Housing Studies*. 2019;34(9):1507–1529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2018.1458293>
- Habraken NJ. *Supports: An Alternative to Mass Housing*. 2nd ed. Urban International Press; 1999.
- Koolhaas R. *Delirious New York: A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan*. New York: Monacelli Press; 1994.
- Schneider T, Till J. *Flexible Housing*. Oxford: Architectural Press; 2007.
- Schneider T, Till J. Flexible housing: The means to the end. *Housing, Theory and Society*. 2005;33(2):118–136. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1359135505000345>
- Tschumi B. *Event-Cities*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; 1994.
- De Jorge-Huertas V. Diagramming architecture: A tool to design. *Frontiers of Architectural Research*. 2018;7(3):412–427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2018.05.002>
- Cellucci C. The flexible housing: Criteria and strategies for implementation of the flexibility. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Architecture*. 2015;9(7):851–861. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1934-7359/2015.07.011>
- Hugentobler M, et al. *Mehr als Wohnen: Cooperative Housing Zurich*. Zurich: Birkhäuser; 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783035604634>
- Tamari T. Metabolism: Utopian urbanism and the Japanese modern architecture movement. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 2014;31(7–8):47–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276414547777>
- Bettaieb DM. *Demystifying flexibility and enhancing quality of life in multi-family housing design*. In: *Architectural Design Quality and Human Well-Being*. Hoboken (NJ): Wiley-Blackwell; 2023. p. 233–251. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119857198.ch10>
- Al Braifkani E, Günçe K. A conceptual framework for analyzing hybridity in architecture: A case study of Baghdad University. *Sustainability*. 2025;17(9):4154. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17094154>
- Costa Santos S, Parnell R, Sarhan J, Squires G, Vardy T. *The Hybrid Home: Adaptable Design for Small Homes with Children*. Dundee: University of Dundee; 2022.
- Borradori G. *Cities in flux: Bergson, Gaudí, Loos. The European Legacy*. 2011;16(7):919–936. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10848770.2011.626212>