

BANDIRMA PARK COMPETITION

A NEW PARK FOR THE FUTURE OF THE CITY

Jury Report





BANDIRMA PARK COMPETITION A NEW PARK FOR THE FUTURE OF THE CITY

This competition has been organised on the initiative of
Balıkesir Metropolitan Municipality in 2016–17.

competition.balikesir.bel.tr

#BandirmaCompetition

JURY REPORT

The following report outlines the processes and the deliberations of the Jury of this competition, articulating the process and considerations in arriving at the selection of the winning scheme for the Bandirma Park Competition.

This report is structured in four distinct parts:

- The background and objectives of the competition
- Judging process
- Jury assessments
- Jury comments on the first prize

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>PROCEEDINGS</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>JURY ASSESSMENTS</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>JURY'S COMMENTS ON THE 1ST PRIZE</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>APPENDIX I</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>APPENDIX II</u>	<u>27</u>

INTRODUCTION

Bandirma Park Competition invited competitors to generate innovative ideas for developing a new genre of park cultivating the notion of spatial design and planning as well as creating a recreational centre at the regional scale.

THE COMPETITION

This competition was organized by the Metropolitan Municipality of Balikesir, in accordance with the Article 23 of the Public Procurement Law No 4734, within the frame of the Regulations for Competitions of Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Engineering, Urban Design Projects, Urban Planning and Works of Fine Art; as an international, open and single stage urban design project competition.

The scope of the competition involved issues requiring a collaboration of multiple disciplines and/or fields of art (planning, urban design, landscape architecture, architecture).

This competition was open to the participation of architects, city planners and landscape architects. The competition jury recommended composition of the teams by different disciplines. Yet it was obligatory that at least one architect should take part in each team, taking into account the differences in disciplinary competence and authorization across the countries in the World. The team leader, in this framework, could be an architect, a landscape architect or a city planner.

ABOUT BANDIRMA

Located in the most dynamic region of Turkey, Bandirma is planned to perform as the major gateway of the growing Turkish industrial export after the envisioned new port. It is foreseen that this regional transformation will catalyse the desired metamorphosis of the spatial quality for the city of Bandirma. The project site, in this regard, suggests a strong opportunity to provide a new and alternative open public space within the dense fabric of the city through the future post-industrial transformation of the region.

THE DELIVERABLES

The competitors were asked to present their drawings in four A0 size boards displayed in horizontal format according to the layout specified in The Competition Book.

These drawings were:

- Urban Context Diagram (Scale 1:5.000)
- Master Plan (Scale 1:1.000)
- Site Plan, sections and elevations (Scale 1:500)
- Floor plans, sections and elevations of Retail Facilities (Scale 1:500)
- Floor plans, sections and elevations of the Institute (Scale 1:200)
- 3D visuals

A Project report in A4 size of 4 pages displayed in vertical format and an additional page including a summary of 300 words was required also.

THE JURY

A Jury Panel comprising of 5 leading Architects and Landscape Architects was established to judge the entries.

The Jury members were:

LOUIS BECKER

ARCHITECT | HENNING LARSEN ARCHITECTS

Louis Becker is Design Principal and Partner at Henning Larsen Architects. With nearly three decades in practice, the scope of his experience spans from the design of cultural icons to city districts, with a particular focus on new building, urban place-making, and the relationship between space, light, and human well-being and interaction. Working in diverse cultures and climates in +20 countries worldwide, Louis works to enhance the built environment through context-driven design. In 2011, Louis was awarded the Eckersberg Medal by the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts as a special recognition of his contribution to the field of architecture and international achievements.

ODILE DECQ (JURY CHAIR)

ARCHITECT & URBAN PLANNER | STUDIO ODILE DECQ

Odile Decq is a French architect and urban planner International renown came in 1990, with her first major commission: La Banque Populaire de l'Ouest in Rennes. Since then, Odile Decq has been faithful to her fighting attitude while diversifying and radicalising her research. The Golden Lion at the Venice Biennale acknowledged her early and unusual career in 1996. Other than just a style, an attitude or a process, Odile Decq's work materialises a complete universe that embraces urban planning, architecture, design and art. Her multidisciplinary approach was recently recognised in 2016 with the Jane Drew Prize and with the Prix Femme Architecte in 2013. Odile Decq has been teaching architecture for the past 25 years, a commitment ratified by the opening in 2014 of her own school in Lyon, France.

CELAL ABDI GUZER

ARCHITECT | PROFESSOR IN MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

C. Abdi Guzer graduated from the Department of Architecture at Middle East Technical University in 1982. He received a British Council research grant and studied on 'Architectural Criticism' at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. Guzer received his doctoral degree from METU where he is currently leading one of the groups in the 4th year architectural design studio. He acted as the vice chair of the Department of Architecture, director of the Program on Architectural Design, Vice Dean of the Faculty of Architecture at Middle East Technical University and the Chairperson of Architects' Association 1927. Guzer has been a jury member in several architectural competitions and received many awards and mentions in national and international competitions including

three first prizes. He realizes most of his projects through METU and has several completed projects including METU MATPUM Research Center, which received YEM Design Award in 2008 and Zeugma Museum, which received Turkish Presidential Award in 2012.

MARTIN REIN-CANO

LANDSCAPING ARCHITECT | TOPOTEK 1

Martin Rein-Cano was born in Buenos Aires in 1967. He studied Art History at Frankfurt University and Landscape Architecture at the Technical Universities of Hannover and Karlsruhe. He trained in the office of Peter Walker and Martha Schwartz in San Francisco. In 1996 he founded TOPOTEK 1. TOPOTEK 1 partakes in a wide variety of international projects and has achieved the first prize in various competitions. Several professional books and articles have been published exclusively on his work, which has been honoured with many awards and prizes, last the Aga Khan Award for Architecture 2016. Martin Rein-Cano has been appointed as a guest professor in different academic institutions in Europe and North America, such as Harvard University. Presently he is teaching at the Dessau Institute for Architecture. He frequently lectures at internationally renowned universities and cultural institutions and regularly serves on competition juries.

GUENTHER VOGT

LANDSCAPING ARCHITECT | VOGT LANDSCHAFTSARCHITEKTEN

Guenther Vogt is a landscape architect with a passion for and a deep knowledge of plants and literature. He founded Vogt Landscape in 2000. Today he develops national and international projects of all types and sizes with some forty employees in his offices in Zurich, London and Berlin. He's Professor for Landscape Architecture at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) in Zurich, Department of Architecture, and was Chairman of Network City and Landscape (NSL). In 2010 he opened his Case Studio VOGT in Zurich. Meant for both office and ETH chair, it is a platform for research and exhibition. Guenther was awarded with the Prix Meret Oppenheim 2012 for his projects and surveys both in landscape architecture and urban development and his constant work with architects and artists. For the fall semester 2012, he was visiting professor in the Faculty for Landscape Architecture at the Harvard GSD.

JURY'S EXPECTATIONS

Jury's main expectations from the competitors, in this framework, were to design an open milieu for generating research and development, experiencing and experimenting space and design, sharing and transferring the universal design knowledge and conception through direct involvement of the public. The existing architectural heritage and the unique characteristics of the natural landscape within the site is to be a valuable ground for conceiving a vital environment for design and research.

The jury looked for creative solutions which are based on integrative, coherent and rich design proposals that will stimulate a new focal area accommodating a diverse set of activities and uses (i.e. recreation, retail and accommodation) in the service of the city and the region.

With this regard, the major concerns of the jury are:

- Ensuring the integration of the project site with the city,
- Creating a focal area to act as the generator of the future transformation,
- Developing a sensitive approach to existing landscape context; site ecology, historical and cultural heritage,
- Devising spatially open, publicly accessible and socially inclusive organization on the site.
- It is believed that with their original program and content, the selected design schemes will suggest a pioneering model that inspires new and novel applications in different urban contexts.

PROCEEDINGS

Bandirma Park Competition was launched on 1 December 2016. The Committee received 125 entries.

All 125 entries (4 x A0 sheets per entry) were pinned up on display in a specially prepared jury room in Balkonuk Center, Balikesir with the Jury assembling from 02-04 March 2016 to review the entries and select 10 award prizes.

The Jury studied all entries professionally and methodically.

DISQUALIFICATION

Before the elimination, the rapporteurship report was presented to the jury in order to decide on disqualifications. After all Jury members examined the rapporteurship report in open discussion, according to the Specification (Chapter 10- RULES FOR DISQUALIFICATION) 34 entries were disqualified from the competition while 91 entries were selected to proceed forward.

Disqualification rules were:

- A. Projects or teams not conforming to the Eligibility Requirements specified in the Competition Regulations.
- B. Projects containing any information or sign that identifies the owner.
- C. Submissions lacking the competition project, the identification envelope and/or its contents.
- D. Projects submitted after the deadline.

Entry number 7 was disqualified according to rules A, B and C.

Following entries were disqualified according to rule D: 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 124 and 125.

1ST ROUND ELIMINATION

After the first round of deliberations the Jury selected 34 entries to proceed forward for further consideration while 56 entries were eliminated.

The eliminated projects in the first elimination round are: 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 88, 90, 120 and 123.

2ND ROUND ELIMINATION

All Jury members reviewed the 34 entries in open discussion. The Jury selected 21 entries to proceed forward for further consideration while 13 entries were eliminated.

The eliminated projects in the first elimination round are (The jury members voted in favour of the project are stated in parenthesis. No names indicates no votes casted in favour):

10 (Celal Abdi Guzer voted in favour), 11, 13 (Celal Abdi Guzer voted in favour), 17 (Martin Rein-Cano voted in favour), 22, 25, 32, 48, 52, 60 (Martin Rein-Cano voted in favour), 67 (Martin Rein-Cano and Louis Becker voted in favour), 83 (Louis Becker voted in favour) and 87.

3RD ROUND ELIMINATION

All Jury members reviewed the 21 entries in open discussion. The Jury selected 10 entries to proceed forward for further consideration while 11 entries were eliminated.

The eliminated projects in the first elimination round are (The jury members voted in favour of the project are stated in parenthesis. No names indicates no votes casted in favour):

21, 24 (Celal Abdi Guzer voted in favour), 26 (Celal Abdi Guzer voted in favour), 27 (Celal Abdi Guzer and Louis Becker voted in favour), 31 (Celal Abdi Guzer and Guenther Vogt voted in favour), 38, 43 (Celal Abdi Guzer voted in favour), 50, 56, 70 (Martin Rein-Cano voted in favour) and 84 (Celal Abdi Guzer voted in favour).

RANKING

The following entries are awarded mentionable prizes. The jury members voted against the entry are stated in parenthesis.

12 7 th mention: 61 (Martin Rein-Cano and Guenther Vogt suggested the project to be in top three-prize group)

6 th mention: 62

5 th mention: 64

4 th mention: 59

3 th mention: 73

2 th mention: 3

1 th mention: 34

The following entries are awarded top three prizes. The jury members voted against the entry are stated in parenthesis.

3rd prize: 5

2nd prize: 89

1st prize: 75 (Martin Rein Cano and Guenther Vogt voted against)

JURY ASSESSMENTS

STATEMENT FROM THE JURY

The jury panel would like to thank the organisers of the Bandirma Park competition for their professional approach and the management of the process. We would like to state the importance of the professionalism of the process, to set an example to the future open international competitions.

The jury has evaluated the projects based on various criteria, the most important one being; the ability to create a destination for the city of Bandirma, the sensibility and innovative solutions towards the preservation issues, the interpretation of the design institute and the robustness of the urban plan being able to include future developments of the city and the site.

The award winning proposals have been selected specifically to identify projects that managed to highlight a certain quality or a potential of the site. Especially the mention prizes should be viewed and evaluated as a catalogue of different architectural ideas, proposing various approaches to the same problem.

2ND ROUND ELIMINATION

10

There is a peculiar approach to the formation of the site. The proposed buildings do not overwhelm the site. Old and new buildings are well integrated in the same context. It is found positive to protect the historical buildings. The sense of park is not applicable to the design proposal. The agricultural park concept was appreciated, however; the concept is not applied within the suggested design solution well. The relationship between the different programmatic functions is well organised.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

11

The structural approach developed on the urban scale is appreciated. However, the articulation of the design approach on the architectural scale is considered underdeveloped. Even though there seems to be a clear understanding of existing historical structures and landscape, this is not reflected in the proposal. The intervention to the existing structures and landscape is overwhelming.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

13

The particular architectural gesture developed by the project has an observable effect only in a certain part of the site, while the rest of the design area seems not well articulated by design. The form does not correspond to the complexity and heterogeneity of the site. Although the project contains many architectural qualities, the site was not developed in a park concept.

The project eliminated with Celal Abdi Guzer's vote in favour of the project.

17

The sense of park that was proposed by the project is considered valuable. The relation between the historical buildings and the proposed structures was appreciated as well as the sensitive design approach suggested towards the landscape. The proposed structures are found out of scale. The positioning of the hotels in the area was criticised.

The project eliminated Martin Rein-Cano's vote in favour of the project.

22

The position of the retail function in the area is appreciated. It is found quite welcoming since it establishes a good connection with the city centre. The architectural language was considered too fragmented to create a coherent whole through the site.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

25

The continuous green structure suggested in the area was regarded as a positive point. Some of the proposed location choices in the area were found problematic. Although the size of 5-star hotel and positioning of 4-star hotel were appreciated, the design institute was found uninspirational. The type of vegetation for the design landscape was questioned.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

32

The consideration of climatic elements of the proposed square was appreciated. The use of topography creating two levels was received well, although the connection between these two elevations was not well established by the design scheme. Connection to the city and creating a gesture for entrance to the area was considered positive, however, the architectural language was found too formalistic. It is stated that a clear concept for the park was lacking.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

48

The project suggests a certain argumentation on scales. This peculiar emphasis was found positive. Even though the modular approach had a successful impact on the human scale, the overall effect created by the architectural language was found over-crowded. The institution's integration with the historical buildings was questioned as well.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

52

The sense of a park is lost in the proposal. There seem to be too many built-up spaces. The design approach developed for the institute that was the core program area for the competition was not considered inspirational.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

60

The idea and design of the hangar was praised. The environmental protection provided by the structure is considered a positive aspect of the project, as well as its integration with the design institute. The connection of the hangar to the surrounding structures was considered weak. The remaining buildings were questioned in size and functionality.

The project eliminated Martin Rein-Cano's vote in favour of the project.

67

A good sense of urban park is established in the proposal. The positioning of larger masses was considered well due to the strong connection established to the city centre. Yet, although the absence of a strict axis and scattered structures enhanced the sense of park, the overall functionality throughout the park was considered unresolved. The design of structures and landscape elements were subject to be criticised as well.

The project eliminated Martin Rein-Cano and Louise Becker's vote in favour of the project.

83

The positioning of the masses and freeing the park area in the centre was considered as a positive aspect of design. The orientation of the park towards the road was criticised. It was concluded that the main focus of the project is on the built structures rather than the park. The design of the institute was considered uninspiring. The choice of vegetation was questioned as well.

The project eliminated Louise Becker's vote in favour of the project.

87

The sequential scenario defining the series of activities and allowing for future growth was considered original and positive about the proposed design. The architectural language was considered inspiring. The proposed pedestrian axis and its necessity within the current design context were questioned. The design of the park was considered underwhelming.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

3RD ROUND ELIMINATION

21

The artificial border created by the roads was criticised. The designated park area was perceived as a leftover space. It is stated that a strong sense of park could not be created. The density of architectural elements was not considered enough to create a coherent tissue.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

24

Although the park scheme is well developed, the positioning and orientation were criticised. The jury honoured that the proposal to preserve the existing foliage and understood the genius. Neither vehicle nor pedestrian access to retail areas was found well resolved, and the positioning and the perceived density were criticised. The attention given to the hierarchy on pedestrian circulation along the park, and how it was reflected to the plantation strategy was highly praised.

The project eliminated with Celal Abdi Guzer's vote in favour of the project.

26

The unique formal statement of the proposal was honoured. However, the density of the master plan, positioning of retail areas and the over-emphasis given to the hotel were criticised. The green areas outside the dense urban composition were not found well articulated and integrated into the overall design scheme.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

27

Even though the idea of simple form/structure was appreciated, the over-simplistic architectural solutions were criticised negatively. Since most of the programmatic requirements were contained within a single structure, the phasing of the implementation did not seem possible. Placement of the design institute at the northwest of the site as an entrance to the park was questioned.

The project eliminated Celal Abdi Guzer's vote in favour of the project.

31

The fundamental idea of hiding the large masses underground and making only the design institute visible was appreciated. Overall, formalistic approach in design was criticised. The design of the institute building was not considered inspirational enough. The location of the open-air amphitheatre on the site was highly criticised due to strong north winds.

The project eliminated Celal Abdi Guzer and Guenther Vogt's vote in favour of the project.

38

The placement of masses was considered arbitrary. The proposal was not found sensitive towards the existing structures and landscape.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

43

The institute has the potential of becoming a destination by design. The idea of designing open public spaces on multiple levels was appreciated. Nevertheless, the idea of centralising the retail areas within the overall scheme is found negative since the commercial identity of the area was over-emphasised. From the historical preservation point of view, the proposal considered to be potentially risky.

The project eliminated Celal Abdi Guzer's vote in favour of the project.

50

The building masses were considered to be too dominant within the overall design scheme. The jury stated that, by the project, there were too much emphasis put on built structures, while the remaining green areas were left underdeveloped.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

56

The scale of the buildings was found positive. However, the overall form-compositions were found incoherent. The functionality of sections in the context of current design scheme was questioned. The green areas at the periphery of the area were considered weakly articulated and unresolved.

The project was eliminated unanimously.

70

Although the sensibility of architectural design was admired, the same approach could not be followed on the larger scale. The master plan was considered highly intensive. The interior spaces and courtyard of the institute were commended.

The project eliminated Martin Rein-Cano's vote in favour of the project.

84

The design treatment of the historical structures was considered quite sensible and original. The over-emphasis of the project on infrastructure was highly criticised. The complexity of overall design was questioned.

The project eliminated Celal Abdi Guzer's vote in favour of the project.

RANKING

61 (7TH HONOURABLE MENTION)

The positioning of the main buildings within the area was found positive. The south-north continuity provided by the design institute was especially admired since the building of the institute serves as a transitional space accordingly. The open areas defined by the buildings were considered interesting. Although the humble landscape proposal was commended, the same level of refinement was not found for architectural design. The geometrical form of the institute emulating the traditional promenade was questioned.

Odile Decq, Celal Abdi Guzer and Louise Becker voted in favour of this project receiving the 7th mention, while Martin Rein-Cano and Guenther Vogt suggested the project to be in top three-prize group.

62 (6TH HONOURABLE MENTION)

Dense forestation facing the main roads is a strong point of the project. The continuity between topography and the vegetated roof was praised. The vegetation scenario for the roofs was considered to be unrealistic for the site's harsh climate. The positioning and orientation of the institute were highly praised, however, the structure was considered to be too separated from the rest of the park. Both pedestrian and vehicular access ways were well articulated, however, the placement of the open-air car park was criticised due to having a panoramic sea view. The pedestrian experience of the retail was well designed. The positioning of the amphitheatre was questioned as it was facing towards the main roads.

The project was voted for the 6th mention unanimously.

64 (5TH HONOURABLE MENTION)

The utilisation of historical structures and design institute were highly complimented since the proposal was highlighting the existing qualities of the landscape. Enlarging the main park area by positioning the large masses at the edges of the site, the phasing of the project was made practical. Graphical presentation quality was criticised.

The project was voted for the 5th mention unanimously.

59 (4TH HONOURABLE MENTION)

The fact that the project suggests a future vision for the park's integration, re-thinking the vehicular and pedestrian connections and urban fabric's continuity to Bandirma's urban life was highly praised. Although the form of the design institute was found inspirational, the overall architectural approach was found too incoherent. The master plan concept was commended.

The project was voted for the 4th mention unanimously.

73 (3RD HONOURABLE MENTION)

The sensibility towards the grown nature amongst the existing structures was celebrated. Although the linear form of the institute was questioned, the integration with the historical structures and the existing landscape was commended. The introduction of agricultural elements to the landscape was received well. Ensuring the north-south continuity through the site, between the existing urban fabric and the shoreline was appreciated. However, the buildings were found disconnected and overall incoherent. The functionality of building forms was highly questioned.

The project was voted for the 3rd mention unanimously.

3 (2ND HONOURABLE MENTION)

Even though the proposal is not applicable, the architectural statement was considered to be quite strong, as the form captures sculptural moments. The existing seaside and the promenade was embraced. The uniqueness of the strategy was noticed. A strong connection with the city and the seafront was highlighted, while how the structure reaches to the shoreline and other buildings were left underdeveloped.

The project was voted for the 2nd mention unanimously.

34 (1ST HONOURABLE MENTION)

The green area was maximised thanks to the strategical placement of the masses. The positioning of the hotels and retail at the edges of the site was considered beneficial for leaving the park as a unified space. The entrance plaza providing access to the site from the city centre was praised, but its distance from the historical core was questioned. Although the structure proposed for the institute was recognised to be possibly impractical, it was considered interesting and would open up to beautiful views. The overall quality of the park was received well.

The project was voted for the 1st mention unanimously.

5 (3RD PRIZE)

The unique quality of the project, which is to be able to create an icon without being too obvious by hiding the masses underground, was commended. The proposal creates a climatically protected neighbourhood underground, as a continuation and reflection of the city. It is assumed that the roof gardens might be impractical to build. A clear zoning strategy is problematic due to the inseparable form of the masses. Even though the commercial masses are oversized, still, the project manages to place focal emphasis on the park and the institute. The jury panel decided to award 3rd prize to this project unanimously, to highlight the unique approach with such simple idea towards the site.

The project was voted for the 3rd prize unanimously.

89 (2ND PRIZE)

The proposal of a design village as the institute was inspirational. The possibility of easily re-arranging the spaces within the institute structure was commended, even though the circulation within the structure was found problematic. Additionally, the differences in the topography were found promising but under-utilised. Furthermore, the position of the institute does not allow for the students to interact with the park effectively. Even though the proposed architectural language was found promising, the iconic effect and the capability of creating a destination was questioned. The architectural concept did not come across clearly. On the other hand, the park was resolved very well; the integration of existing landscape qualities to the overall proposal was praised. The positioning of architectural elements (hotel buildings and retail) was commended. Taking different phases of the project and how the area will develop over time into account was appreciated.

The project was voted for the 2nd prize unanimously.

75 (1ST PRIZE)

The proposal was acclaimed with its architectonic effect that would create a landmark in the region. The simplicity of the idea of a continuous ring gathering the park together, using the institute serving as a transitional device was celebrated. The ease of communicating the message of the project was considered highly advantageous. The ring floating over the historical structures, lightly touching the ground becomes an icon without overwhelming the existing qualities of the site. A new experience has been designed for the public, by allowing access to the top of the ring and creating vistas that have not seen before. The master plan decisions, placing the hotels and retail areas to the edges of the site and placing the institute in the centre as an inseparable element of the park was found to be a successful strategy. Although the preservation of the existing landscape could be a good strategy, the daily usage of the site was not taken into consideration. It should be noted that the area is not a natural preservation park, but a public amenity. The park's scenario is not clearly defined.

Odile Decq, Celal Abdi Guzer and Louise Becker voted in favour of this project receiving the 1st prize, while Martin Rein-Cano and Guenther Vogt voted against, due to concerns regarding landscape design quality.

JURY'S COMMENTS ON THE 1ST PRIZE

In regards to the master plan decisions, while the locations of the hotels and retail area were commended, the position of the 4-star hotel was debated as it could be grouped together with other large masses. The vehicular road passing through the site, under the design institute was highly criticised as such central vehicle access to the site might be damaging to the park.

The project report suggests that the park was considered as an ecological preservation area, while the expected use should be a public park with daily use. Therefore the jury suggested that the design team should re-evaluate their landscape approach to design a park. It should be remembered that a park is for the use of people, so the design team is suggested to design a park that people can enjoy and increase the richness of public life and find potentials in the existing landscape. The use of windmills was highly questioned.

The proposed thickness of the circle was considered not sufficient, as it had a negative effect on the flexibility of the space and at times the institute turned into a long corridor. For a better-used design institute, the design team should consider a minimum floor plan width of 12m. Although the use of a circle as the main architectural form was considered successful, the break in the circle was thought to reduce the overall strength of the form and deemed it arbitrary. The use of water element that breaks the continuity should be re-evaluated. It was noted that, the shaded areas under the circle might be difficult to develop in means of landscape and the design team should develop specific design schemes for these areas.

Furthermore, the use and programming of existing buildings should be refined.

APPENDIX I

ENTRY NO - ALIAS

<u>001</u>	<u>1212KH</u>	<u>043</u>	<u>2314NN</u>	<u>085</u>	<u>CC1010</u>
<u>002</u>	<u>XM0705</u>	<u>044</u>	<u>7341KO</u>	<u>086</u>	<u>LO2773</u>
<u>003</u>	<u>NA8471</u>	<u>045</u>	<u>N65T27</u>	<u>087</u>	<u>PS0734</u>
<u>004</u>	<u>ED7043</u>	<u>046</u>	<u>2612DG</u>	<u>088</u>	<u>S0X472</u>
<u>005</u>	<u>RT1503</u>	<u>047</u>	<u>M1418K</u>	<u>089</u>	<u>UZ1972</u>
<u>006</u>	<u>0126LK</u>	<u>048</u>	<u>BU1527</u>	<u>090</u>	<u>WLO317</u>
<u>007</u>	<u>1234AS</u>	<u>049</u>	<u>FS0639</u>	<u>091</u>	<u>NJ5307</u>
<u>008</u>	<u>AH2741</u>	<u>050</u>	<u>QX7391</u>	<u>092</u>	<u>3420GS</u>
<u>009</u>	<u>ES2614</u>	<u>051</u>	<u>DF7485</u>	<u>093</u>	<u>HR7970</u>
<u>010</u>	<u>MU3791</u>	<u>052</u>	<u>6531BM</u>	<u>094</u>	<u>AH1331</u>
<u>011</u>	<u>MO3579</u>	<u>053</u>	<u>GC2819</u>	<u>095</u>	<u>DW1981</u>
<u>012</u>	<u>1403MN</u>	<u>054</u>	<u>8142LK</u>	<u>096</u>	<u>CO2963</u>
<u>013</u>	<u>VH2135</u>	<u>055</u>	<u>SC0902</u>	<u>097</u>	<u>3751ZA</u>
<u>014</u>	<u>NP1128</u>	<u>056</u>	<u>PA2701</u>	<u>098</u>	<u>MH1705</u>
<u>015</u>	<u>19PA60</u>	<u>057</u>	<u>0061AA</u>	<u>099</u>	<u>TG7591</u>
<u>016</u>	<u>AG9738</u>	<u>058</u>	<u>FD3108</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>BB4810</u>
<u>017</u>	<u>M3481E</u>	<u>059</u>	<u>CT1513</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>CB9876</u>
<u>018</u>	<u>EC1724</u>	<u>060</u>	<u>BM1593</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>5G37M1</u>
<u>019</u>	<u>479AB3</u>	<u>061</u>	<u>4856NG</u>	<u>103</u>	<u>LT7982</u>
<u>020</u>	<u>07AR26</u>	<u>062</u>	<u>TP9425</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>1729FG</u>
<u>021</u>	<u>L93A25</u>	<u>063</u>	<u>1346AE</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>SM6351</u>
<u>022</u>	<u>20PM17</u>	<u>064</u>	<u>WX2153</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>QT2687</u>
<u>023</u>	<u>DA2147</u>	<u>065</u>	<u>2175AR</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>2419BD</u>
<u>024</u>	<u>BM4217</u>	<u>066</u>	<u>2697HO</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>0937BP</u>
<u>025</u>	<u>PT2910</u>	<u>067</u>	<u>GM1607</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>AE1362</u>
<u>026</u>	<u>RE5829</u>	<u>068</u>	<u>CP5213</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>TE1078</u>
<u>027</u>	<u>GD4972</u>	<u>069</u>	<u>C4712H</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>HN1203</u>
<u>028</u>	<u>MI2345</u>	<u>070</u>	<u>4518AN</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>XM2107</u>
<u>029</u>	<u>MN3579</u>	<u>071</u>	<u>LI3585</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>MZ5624</u>
<u>030</u>	<u>X83Y25</u>	<u>072</u>	<u>XZ2031</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>AP3481</u>
<u>031</u>	<u>7TU521</u>	<u>073</u>	<u>LT3157</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>6K89B2</u>
<u>032</u>	<u>GB1374</u>	<u>074</u>	<u>VS6927</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>OA1357</u>
<u>033</u>	<u>RDUC28</u>	<u>075</u>	<u>BT2194</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>62G85T</u>
<u>034</u>	<u>PB5027</u>	<u>076</u>	<u>AK6938</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>17BE38</u>
<u>035</u>	<u>D2A137</u>	<u>077</u>	<u>OK7182</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>U2097E</u>
<u>036</u>	<u>DM2416</u>	<u>078</u>	<u>5823TT</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>85G63P</u>
<u>037</u>	<u>0324SY</u>	<u>079</u>	<u>3072AP</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>AM2479</u>
<u>038</u>	<u>2816SZ</u>	<u>080</u>	<u>0217GK</u>	<u>122</u>	<u>2609RA</u>
<u>039</u>	<u>SM6984</u>	<u>081</u>	<u>1507NK</u>	<u>123</u>	<u>2745GN</u>
<u>040</u>	<u>2Q5F79</u>	<u>082</u>	<u>5432XM</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>2014BS</u>
<u>041</u>	<u>SE8092</u>	<u>083</u>	<u>9375AE</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>2WK435</u>
<u>042</u>	<u>XM2379</u>	<u>084</u>	<u>BA1721</u>		

APPENDIX II

AWARD GROUP IDENTIFICATION

1ST PRIZE

ENTRY NUMBER: 75

ALIAS: BT2194

DESIGN TEAM

Zuhal Kol (Architect-Turkey)

Carlos Zarco Sanz (Architect-Spain)

Jose Luis Hidalgo (Architect-Spain)

Meliz Akyol (Landscape Architect-Turkey)

ASSISTANTS

Sara Palomar Perez (Architect-Spain)

CONSULTANT

Meliz Akyol (Landscape Architect-Turkey)

2ND PRIZE

ENTRY NUMBER: 89

ALIAS: UZ1972

DESIGN TEAM

Nilufer Kozikoglu (Architect, Turkey)

Azime Tezer (City Planner, Turkey)

Ebru Erbas Gurler (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

Nazife Tugce Onuk (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

Burcu Altun, (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

İzel Beşikci, (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

Necdet Yalın Öcal, (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

Bilge Aydın, (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

Ebru Satılmış, (City Planner, Turkey)

Merve Karadaban, (Architect, Turkey)

Adnan Kaplan, (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

Nuran Altun, (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

Gizem Ezgi Kurangil, (Industrial Product Designer, Turkey)

ASSISTANTS

Cem Eren Güven, (Architect, Turkey)

Pınar Geçkili, (Architect, Turkey)

Gerçek Annaniyazov, (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

Ezgi Umut Türkoğlu, (Student of Landscape Architecture, Turkey)

Turkan Alp Onsal, (Architect, Turkey)

Hasan Agah Erkan, (Architect, Turkey)

Berk Arınç, (Architect, Turkey)

Zümra Okursoy, (Architect, Turkey)

Gizem Akgün, (Architect, Turkey)

Aydan Aslan, (Architect, Turkey)

3RD PRIZE

ENTRY NUMBER: 5

ALIAS: RT1503

DESIGN TEAM

Claudia Ricciardi (Architect – Italy)

Marco Tanzilli (Architect – Italy)

Jedd W Heap (Architect – USA)

Derek Mark Pirozzi (Architect – USA)

1ST HONOURABLE MENTION

ENTRY NUMBER: 34

ALIAS: PB5027

DESIGN TEAM

Can Kubin (City Planner, Turkey)

Zeynep Eraydin (City Planner, Turkey)

Onur Yuncu (Architect, Turkey)

Mehmet A. Ozmen (City Planner, Turkey)

Yuksel Cetinkaya (Landscape Architect, Turkey)

R. Aytul Baran Ozkan (Architect, Turkey)

2ND HONOURABLE MENTION

ENTRY NUMBER: 3

ALIAS: NA8471

DESIGN TEAM

Aybars Asci (Architect, USA)

3RD HONOURABLE MENTION

ENTRY NUMBER: 73

ALIAS: LT3157

DESIGN TEAM

Julian Andres Restrepo Molina (Architect, Colombia)

Merve Bedir (Architect, The Netherlands/Turkey)

Peter Veenstra (Architect, The Netherlands)

4TH HONOURABLE MENTION

ENTRY NUMBER: 59

ALIAS: CT1513

DESIGN TEAM

Umit Tarik Yasar (Landscape Architect – Turkey)

Nurhak Inan Karacay (Landscape Architect – Turkey)

Ilker Ertugrul (Architect – Turkey)

ASSISTANTS

Tuğyan Kepkep (Landscape Architect – Turkey)

Bengi Altunay (Architect – Turkey)

Başak Enuysal (Architect – Turkey)

Ali Talha Koç (Architect – Turkey)

Lizge Oturan (Landscape Architect – Turkey)

Merve Yavuz (Landscape Architect – Turkey)

5TH HONOURABLE MENTION

ENTRY NUMBER: 64

ALIAS: WX2153

DESIGN TEAM

Mehmet Zafer Unal (Architect – Turkey)

Cihan Sinan Bostanci (Architect – Turkey)

6TH HONOURABLE MENTION

ENTRY NUMBER: 62

ALIAS: TP9425

DESIGN TEAM

Philip Turner (Architect – UK)

Andrew Weston (Architect – UK)

7TH HONOURABLE MENTION

ENTRY NUMBER: 61

ALIAS: 4856NG

DESIGN TEAM

João Ferreira Nunes (Landscape Architect – Portugal)

Ricardo Bak Gordon (Architect – Portugal)

