



E17 JURY STATEMENT

SHORTLIST

SKÚPNOTŠ CINKARNA

AE591

1st stage assessment - local commission: Jury member 1: This project presents good ideas that we can discuss, but the sole project is not so good because it is not specific. This location needs something specific and worked out in phases to avoid a repeat of the Technopolis case.

Jury member 2: I think we could realize part of it in any case, maybe in a different location, maybe here. I don't think that there is anything special about this team. They're quite generic in their thinking. They're thinking in terms of trends. But it's not a solution that I would choose as a winner.

Jury member 3: It is interesting that the project provided for soil mixing to improve the quality and, at the same time, provided for gardening. This could be interesting for the city, as we do not yet have a gardening strategy planned. Soil vents are also important in the project, which is good because it shows that the team thought about contaminated soil.

Jury member 4: The project is interesting, but it's too big. It can be implemented somewhere somehow. Maybe not at this location.

Jury member 5: It's a great project, but we're not sure about its scope. If we take away the architecture that is essential to this project, what can happen in real life, we get a new approach to the landscape, in which we have something radical: the socialization of the landscape.

Jury member 6: I think this project is generic because it's like the green vertical gardens that are everywhere. As a strategy, it's okay, but it's something that I really have an issue with. This project doesn't really give the answer. It says we don't give the answer - people in the future will give those answers.

Jury member 7: What this project gives me is exactly the opposite of the other projects. I think this group would give me some interesting thoughts that we could evolve in our further consideration. Despite the fact that the task does not answer many questions but opens up new ones, it says a lot.



Final assessment - international jury: The project is highly valued for conceptually rich statement and a strong claim for community. The jury agrees it's not about the design but the idea of coming together and negotiating which can evolve into something valuable in the long term. General discussion about the meaning of urban gardening in this specific location arises due to some other more appropriate areas in the city. Still the idea is very much appreciated and is certainly understood as a principle of social gathering or social cohesion. The jury agrees that although the idea itself is very strong, the proposal itself is more of a claim and is not developed far enough.