

# Jury protocol of architectural competition of Estonian Business School

Zoom appointments:

19/03/2020 from 10:00 to 13:00

07/04/2020 from 10:00 to 13:00

16/04/2020 from 19:00 to 21:00

22/06/2020 from 17:00 to 18:30

Participants: jury members Mart Habakuk, Viljar Arakas, Mart Kalm, Ignar Fjuk, Indrek Allmann, Ülar Mark, and expert Reijo Kerdmann. Ülar Mark was absent from the last meeting but gave his preferences as a written document.

Secretary: Tiit Sild

Protocolled by: Tuuli Tshakna and Tiit Sild

The jury of the architectural competition considers the architectural competition to be successful: a number of original solutions were submitted that have strong potential as an extension and supplement to the university study complex, in addition to which several competition entries create strong urban dominants.

The jury considered the entries with the keywords Cremona, Kontuur, Campus park and Pedestal to be the strongest, the authors of those entities presented their entries to the jury at the zoom presentation on April 7.

The functional solutions of the different volumes of the competition entries were solved at such different levels that the selection of a winner in one round was not possible, therefore the jury decided to organise an additional round to which three entries were invited. The authors of these three works were given specific detailed instructions.

To supplement the competition entries, additional funds of € 4,000 were given to all competitors selected by the organisers.

The decision was taken to award the prize fund of €20,000 at the end of the additional round, according to the conditions of the competition and the decision of the jury.

It was decided to show all entries to the participants after the final determination of the winners. The competition entries also proposed several solutions that did not correspond to the detail planning, although with most of these solutions the non-compliances with the detail planning were of such a small extent that they could be brought into accordance with the plan with further design work. Therefore, this argument did not become decisive for the evaluation of any of the entries.

At the meeting held on 22/06/2020, the jury of the architectural competition decided to declare the competition work with the keyword Kontuur (Ala Architects) the winner. Second place went to the competition entry with the keyword Cremona (Alver Arhitektid) and the third place went to the competition entry with the keyword Campus Park (Kaos Arhitektid). The result was accomplished by voting.

Jury decided to divide prize fund of 20 000€ as follows: Kontuur: 8000€, Cremona: 7000€, Campus Park 5000€

## Jury comments on the competition entries:

### Campus Park

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/07ptyfe61dcsjwx/CAMPUS%20PARK.pdf?dl=0>



This competition entry has a very original solution to one of the school's most burning problems: where and how to build the main entrance to the school. By cutting a hole in the old house, the new main entrance to the school is emphasized and people are effectively led to the new study building. The city will be brought to the school, making the entrance from Lembitu Street much more attractive. The complete separation of the new and old volumes is also a smart idea from a construction point of view because both construction and moving a school function is quite easy to solve as such. Between the new and the old buildings there is a street-wide area, the lighting conditions of which are not ideal, but which could still work for the whole idea. The dull rear of the old house has been significantly redesigned. Turning the volume of the old building along Lembitu Street into an apartment building is also a smart idea, although the jury's opinions on that solution was not decided on consensus. Based on the functional planning, as well as on the facade solution of the new school building, the jury sees the solution as a bit too ordinary. On the one hand, similar skyscrapers can be seen in many capitals of Eastern countries and so the solution is not very original, although on the other hand the shape of the tower (rounded corners and facade articulation) addresses the inherent street-level wind problem (the building's rounded corners could reduce the number of top-down windows significantly, contributing to a better street space. The evacuation solution of the tower has not been completed and the tower's stairs are probably too narrow (see fire safety in the competition conditions, document Lauteri 3 - Fire\_safety\_ENG). In addition, according to the jury, the tower's silhouette is not attractive enough. The roof park in the tower needs additional mechanisms to protect it from wind.

#### Compliance of the solution with the detailed plan:

The area under the tower is slightly larger than allowed by the detailed plan, but according to the jury it could easily be brought into line with the plan. The closed gross area is slightly larger than allowed by the detailed planning at  $34,225 \text{ m}^2 + 7,038 \text{ m}^2 = 41,263 \text{ m}^2$  vs  $41,241 \text{ m}^2$  in the DP (including the existing building). However, according to the jury, this can be reconciled relatively easily.

More entrance and exit connections are planned from Kuke Street than in the DP.

### The jury's recommendation to further develop of the entry:

- Jury likes the bold approach to opening a new volume from Lauteri Street. This topic should be further developed, taking into account the fact that school functions will continue in the existing building. If desired it would be possible to combine the functions of the old and new buildings to a height of up to 4 floors (apx. 29 m).
- The proposed tower solution makes a weak contribution to urban space rather than enriching it. The car park on the Kuke Street side of the building is not a good solution. Kuke Street will become wider for pedestrians and would need better connections to the new building. Parking would preferably be on the underground floors and, if necessary, up to three underground floors can be used.
- The authors need to rethink the functional solution of the school in the new building volume (by removing the car park, a public area necessary for the operation of the school will be created).

### Further development of Campus Park

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/kccxrddkkaosx2k/Campus%20Park%20-%20v2.pdf?dl=0>



The jury of the architectural competition considers the further development of the competition work to be positive especially in the shape of tower but considers the introduction of a large part of the green tower and the roof area of the lower school volume to be an impractical solution that does not function as well as it could. There is a risk, with an opaque glass facade, that this technical solution will lose a large amount of representativeness shown in the rendered images. The entrance solution from Lembitu street is not as attractive as it was in the first phase entry white empty courtyard between the old and new building. The separation of housing and university to different buildings that would have let the construction in two phases has been lost.

## Cremona



<https://www.dropbox.com/s/pbtxddckk8nidk5/CREMONA.pdf?dl=0>

A conceptually strong solution with the building's atrium design dignified and acting perfectly as an organiser of the school space. The merging of the new and the old buildings has been carried out spectacularly, although the solution does not correspond to the detailed plan (the DP allows the creation of a connection through 2 floors). The back of the old house is not as architecturally attractive as the main wall of the atrium facade. Opening the windows of the old building to the interior is also a bit problematic. Solving the tower with slender volumes leaning against each other is also a very sympathetic solution that emphasises the entrance of the school building on Lennuki Street. Unfortunately, however, this does not produce the silhouette of a slender tower (this solution would work better in a building 10 stories higher). The solution on the Lauteri Street side of the building (essentially the existing volume) does not create a sufficiently representative main entrance to the school. We recommend considering the spatial rethinking of the entrance on Lauteri Street.

### **Compliance of the solution with the detailed plan:**

The gross (heated) surface area of the new building is 31,985 m<sup>2</sup> vs the 28,998 m<sup>2</sup> allowed by the DP, although according to the jury it is possible to bring this in line with the DP. Part of the high-rise building goes beyond the requirement set by the DP that the average area under the building should not exceed 820 m<sup>2</sup> (900 on the lower floors, mostly 810 m<sup>2</sup>). According to the jury, however, it is relatively easy to bring this into line with the detailed plan without compromising the basic concept of the building. The connection to the old building is made through 4 floors. It is possible to align them with the DP by reducing the number of stories or by publishing and receiving a new DP.

### **The jury's recommendation to further develop of the entry:**

- The solution for the tower is inefficient (the ratio of the area of the facade to the useful area is poor, which makes operation of the building expensive) and visually gives a thicker impression than alternative solutions with a similar building area.

- According to the jury, the connection between the old and the new school building (through 4 floors) is a good solution and could be maintained as such.
- The existing main entrance of the university on Lauteri Street will remain weak with the addition of such a new volume.

## Further development of Cremona



<https://www.dropbox.com/s/98cst79e8z27txt/Cremona%20-%20v2.pdf?dl=0>

The proposal emphasises the school entrance from Lauteri Street, which has been designed presentably and sensitively. This part of the tower has become somewhat lighter, but the volume is still a bit stubby from several directions. The layout solutions of the school building part are sensitive and create a pleasant study space for classes, auditoriums and shared spaces. The plans of the tower part have the most inefficient ratio of the net area used (rented out) to the area under construction.

## Kontuur

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/p6h7w3dwr0nzf4m/KONTUUR.pdf?dl=0>



The strongest part of this competition entry is the elegant and memorable tower, which creates a unique urban dominant for the city. Balconies help prevent direct sunlight from reaching the glass facades. The general construction of the tower is understandable and the presented diagram is logical. At the same time, the simple and clear form is rich in nuances and fully functional and ready and adaptable for further developed planning solutions.

The concept for the school solution is not as strong as the tower – the plan solutions are not convincing in how they meet the needs of the school. As a considerable flow of people will pass through the old building, the connection of the old and the new parts of the building with the narrow corridor is not sufficient, with the spiral staircase running in some places in addition to the corridor connection. The café terrace between the two buildings in the shade of the old building and

the multifunctional space would certainly not work well in this location. The atrium staircase on the Lennuki Street façade has been solved with a very small scattering area.

Bringing the parking underground to three floors is a smart solution that allows the entire perimeter of the building to be solved in relation to the urban space.

#### **Compliance of the solution with the detailed plan:**

The solution does not correspond to the detail planning for the buildable area of the base of the tower, which is 900 m<sup>2</sup> – in the detailed plan, the average area of the tower part of the building base is 820 m<sup>2</sup>. According to the jury, the solution is relatively easy to bring into line with the detailed plan. The third underground floor does not correspond to the detail planning.

#### **The jury's recommendation to further develop of the entry:**

- Explain how it is possible to separate the balconies of the apartments and hotels without significantly damaging the building's visuals.
- Explain how the prevention of cold bridges associated with balconies is ensured.
- Reinterpret the functional solution of school volume. Improve the connection between the old and the new buildings so that they act as a solution that supports the functionality of a comprehensive school. If desired, a competition entry could also be offered where the new and old volumes are connected from a height of up to 4 floors (apx. 29 m).
- The entrance to the new volume through Lauteri Street is important and needs a bolder approach.
- Parking under the tower can be an obstacle to choosing the optimal design solution. It would be advisable to leave underground parking under the lower volume of the building. A parking solution on three underground floors could also be offered.

#### **Contour further development**



<https://www.dropbox.com/s/v9tbia8kj4jdy7g/Kontuur%20-%20v2.pdf?dl=0>

Although the lower part of the building has been improved, as expected, the proposal still represents the tower more strongly. The volume of the school has been significantly improved and has a much more rational approach. However, the parking solution, which is half a storey above ground cuts direct access to the school from Lennuki Street. Jury proposes that this could be improved in further development phases.





## Pilk

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/5zzx66d2t6j59x3/PILK.pdf?dl=0>



The articulated roof landscape built on the fifth floor has a charming effect. The school volume is practically and understandably functionally solved, simple and logical. The high-rise part of the building is not attractive, the articulation remains a little heavy and not well justified. Unfortunately, the facade of the school building is also quite expressionless.

### **Compliance of the solution with the detailed plan:**

The gross heated area is slightly larger than allowed according to the detail planning (29,131.8 m<sup>2</sup> vs 28,998 m<sup>2</sup>). The solution would be relatively easy to adapt to the DP.

## Giraffe

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/7zonkpm28t7py6t/GIRAFFE.pdf?dl=0>



There is a certain solidarity in the unity of the tower. The proposal is clearly readable and easy to follow. The plans of the apartments are logical. Movement at the pedestrian level is well thought out, and the opening of commercial premises at street level creates an active urban space. However, the solution is not one of the jury's favourites. Sun visors (lamelles) are a challenge to snow and everything else.

### **Compliance of the solution with the detailed plan:**

The solution corresponds to the DP.

## Hive

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/fggmedd398g58lb/HIVE.pdf?dl=0>



The planned solution of the building is functionally well solved. The building is clearly different from other high-rise buildings and has a well-thought-out ecological concept. The evacuation solution for the tower is incomplete, there is no escape staircase. Due to the colour scheme, the building still has a cloddish effect and is not one of the jury's favourites.

### **Compliance of the proposal with the detail planning:**

The closed gross area of the building is 34,139 m<sup>2</sup> vs the 28,998 m<sup>2</sup> allowed by the detailed plan.

The jury considers that, although it would not be very easy, the solution could still developed further to be in line with the detailed plan.

## Pjedestaal

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/ibmtm7glps6m8ou/PJEDESTAAL.pdf?dl=0>



A proposal clearly different from other entries, on which the jury did not reach a complete consensus. The stacked tower has its own charm and the window division, with different densities, works well in this context. The external entrance staircase facing Lennuk Street marks an entrance area spectacular way and is well connected with the symmetrical façade solution of the old building, but this means that the interior of the school suffers a loss of space. Such a strong opening towards Lennuki Street cannot be trusted.

#### **Compliance of the solution with the detailed plan:**

The closed gross area is 29,782 m<sup>2</sup> vs the 28,998 m<sup>2</sup> allowed by the DP. However, the solution is relatively easy to adapt.

### **The Stitch**

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/2ijy1yxm3c0c1bv/THE%20STITCH.pdf?dl=0>



The learning facility and the parking solutions are logical; however, the jury does not have a uniformly favourable opinion of the solution for the exterior finishing of the building. Large stone/concrete surfaces and low glass surfaces give the advantage of energy saving, but they also give the building the fortress-like appearance. Small windows do not work as the surfaces are not open enough to the view.

This is probably a wider trend, according to which buildings are rather turned inwards, but the jury disagrees with this direction and the work is therefore not one of their favourites.

#### **Compliance of the solution with the detailed plan:**

The closed gross area of 29,115 m<sup>2</sup> slightly exceeds the 28,998 m<sup>2</sup> allowed in the detail planning. According to the jury, however, it would be relatively easy to bring this into line with the plan.

The floor area of the high-rise building varies, but on average it is still larger than the 820 m<sup>2</sup> allowed in the detailed plan. However, the solution is relatively easy to bring into line with the detail planning