

E17 JURY STATEMENT

SHORTLIST

REVIVING CINKARNA: AN INTERCONNECTED PROCESS INTO AN SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

PH895

1st stage assessment - local commission: Jury member 1: It is good how projects integrated into the city fabric and how they propose to use the green land with the remediation of the land. I'm not sure that this is enough for our location, but the project has an interesting concept.

Jury member 2: From the point of view of urban development in the northern part, it is quite similar to what we already have there. So it follows this kind of building pattern. It's open to new programs that could appear here, so this is very pragmatic. It opens to the capital; it can potentially change radically in the future because the architecture is not defined in any way. The common spaces and the green space have a lot of potential for the usage of the city, although I'm not sure if it's the best option or the connection thing. The bridge is the best design idea as a monumental entry point from the square, close to the youth center and Saint Maximilian Church. So it can also open up to the city center and add value.

Jury member 3: Recognizable good phasing in a project that follows one another in a meaningful way. The wide, open spaces that are created are interesting. Also, worth mentioning is the tree nursery, which would help with planting and replanting trees.

Jury member 4: What can the project give people to make it a reality, not a dream? Ingredients that can be given to them immediately. For example, to make a bridge, some kind of intervention, or some kind of park, something that really benefits people's lives.

Jury member 5: I think the interesting value of this one is that, in terms of open space, the design is actually very structured and very clear. The proposed process is highly adaptable. And it also takes some distance from the railway to the infrastructure here because it's a fine distance, which is not present there. It has potential.

Jury member 6: Although we see the end result in these panels, I see the real quality is actually phasing for this project, and it kind of explains that on the bottom ribbon. They establish a park that cleans the area, and then they build beside the park. Maybe it's a long shot, but also, like Central Park in New York, they're the most



valuable crop of the site from this point of view.

Jury member 7: The bridge could become a physical realization of connecting cities with that part of the city that currently no longer exists in people's consciousness. It connects well to the northwest of the location. The project is perhaps the most feasible of the entire selection, as it is not so specific but is pragmatic and would probably be well received by the community as well.

Final assessment - international jury: From the perspective of urban structure as well as the connection to other areas of the city the project was much appreciated. The jury values the amount of content and attention to detail. Even so, what is not clear enough is a strong vision making. The jury also agrees the project is not site specific enough. Even though the team proposes different measures (reorganization of topography, tree nursery etc.), the project seems as it could also be placed on a non-polluted land.