



E16 JURY STATEMENT

PRESELECTION

CAMPUS

IM408

1st stage assessment - local commission: The proposal introduces an interesting architectural feature: the cloister garden. Conceived inside the block, it plays with the inversion of different degrees of publicness within the courtyard and also with its surrounding outer spaces. The additional level of the cloister, which is open to the public, creates a certain publicness, in an otherwise intimate courtyard. Thus, the question about the effect the internal circulation might have for the use of the space outside the courtyard, is raised. Although the structures are spatially clear-cut, there is an intermingling of programmes envisaged, which seems interesting. Hence, the concern is that the space outside the courtyards might not be frequented enough. It raises the question by the site owners, of who will actually pay for this (less frequented) outdoor space.

The conceptual approach is seen as interesting, at the same time it raises contradiction. The handling of the existing buildings, which will be programmed in an interesting way and promise a high spatial quality, is noted positively.

Final assessment - international jury: The jury acknowledges the project as an approach that works explicitly different on the idea of open space-types, recording spatial figures such as courtyards, squares, and streets. It values the project's suggestion of inverting the old perimeter block typology. On ground floor mediating programs deal with the inside-out relationship, which are convincingly proposed as two-side-orientated uses. Unanswered is the aspect on the quality of the public space as a fabric, not only looking at the cloistered garden and the central square, but at the streets and the transitional spaces in between. What is the idea of the overall sequence of spaces with their different degrees and qualities of publicness? The porosity explained in the text, was convincing, but fell short in the actual project – the low passages to the courtyard lack generosity, the character of the big central space in the middle is not convincing. Unfortunately, the interesting dialogue between the locality and the territory (including the impact of the train) has been missed out. In relation to this dialogue a clearer definition of the sort of spaces, for example drawing on specific senses of community or collectivity could have brought an energizing tension to the area, which could have helped to specify the various public spaces, which, unfortunately remain too unspecific.