

ZT prize National Student Architectural Design Competition '22

“power” of architecture

Jury Report

The jury of “ZT prize National Student Architectural Design Competition '22; “power” of architecture” held an online meeting session on 10 January 2023, between 3:30 PM and 7:30 PM (UTC+3) to evaluate all of the **77** qualifying submissions.

All jury members were present during the session and consisted of the following individuals (*in alphabetical order of surname*):

Kaya Arikoglu_M.Arch | NCARB

Emre Arolat_M.Arch | Hon. FAIA | RIBA

Noah Bergman_M.Arch | AIA | WELL AP | LEED AP | NCARB

Zeynep Onur_M. Arch | Ph.D.

Ozlem Taskin Onen_M. Arch.

Jury Advisory Member **Kaan Tanali** (PE) and rapporteurs **Alper Gunduz** and **Ruya Ozturk** were also present during the jury session. Rapporteur **Asli Kusmenoglu Sarikaya** was absent during the session.

The jury members appointed Ozlem Taskin Onen as the jury president.

Preliminary Checks:

Student identification documents, application forms, and project submittals had been checked by the rapporteurs following the submission deadline of 09 December 2022. Out of 81 total submissions, four projects were disqualified due to non-compliance with the Eligibility Requirements explained in the Competition Brief. Those were:

Alias	Reason for disqualification
slowtakes	Alias and the submittal do not follow the formatting requirements
zt16900	The submittal was stated to be submitted for another competition that violates the exclusivity requirements of this competition.
zt21212	The submittal was in Turkish (i.e. did not follow the language requirements) and included personal information violating the anonymity requirement.
zt40477	The submittal was from an Interior Architecture student. Per the Eligibility Requirements, only students from Architecture are qualified for this competition.

Anonymity of Entries:

The remaining 77 qualifying projects were given a random number from 01 to 77 by the rapporteurs to provide anonymity and ease of reference. These numbers were digitally covered over the aliases before being shared with the jury members.

Projects with these new numbers were shared with the jury members on 21 December 2022 prior to the jury session to allow for a thorough pre-review.

The jury members signed a declaration of honesty indicating they had not seen the projects participating in the competition before the date of 21 December 2022.

First Evaluation Round:

Each project numbered from 01 to 77 was opened to discussion and jointly reviewed by the jury members. The high quality of presentations and the ability to use architectural language to approach the subject were considered common factors in all presented proposals. The variety of ideas brought forward in the proposals was found remarkable. The jury was pleased to see that all the submissions were well presented with proper architectural language, each with unique ideas and remarkable propositions.

However, given the vast number of submissions, 48 projects were unanimously eliminated in the first round due to failing to bring forward a strong architectural concept that seeks to convey “the power of architecture”. The aliases of the eliminated projects are listed as follows:

02 (zt47474)	37 (zt33033)	61 (zt13725)
11 (zt14001)	39 (zt32941)	62 (zt06087)
13 (zt08221)	41 (zt29066)	63 (zt34135)
18 (zt22912)	42 (zt48297)	64 (zt92018)
20 (zt44044)	43 (zt11053)	66 (zt537046)
22 (zt11002)	44 (zt11511)	67 (zt24307)
23 (zt15104)	47 (zt18042)	68 (zt13520)
26 (zt05201)	48 (zt64479)	69 (zt00001)
27 (zt23229)	49 (zt85246)	70 (zt97126)
28 (zt08693)	50 (zt23719)	71 (zt97520)
29 (zt12037)	51 (zt02029)	72 (zt17406)
30 (zt08072)	52 (zt18031)	73 (zt24176)
32 (zt52013)	53 (zt72464)	74 (zt05321)
34 (zt24082)	54 (zt88761)	75 (zt92752)
35 (zt31037)	55 (zt05249)	76 (zt16275)
36 (zt55555)	59 (zt65925)	77 (zt09454)

The jury voted for the remaining 29 projects to proceed to the second evaluation round.

Second Evaluation Round:

The following 16 projects were eliminated in the second evaluation round with brief justifications as stated below:

01 Kayseri Architecture Center (zt35890)

Population - interactivity - connectivity - density were positive concepts in this project. However, since a strong architectural execution was deemed missing, the project was unanimously eliminated.

03 Addition (zt19073)

Fine execution, humbleness, and realizability were positive notes on this project. However, the project lacked a strong approach to the subject of the competition which is the *“power of architecture”* and therefore unanimously eliminated.

04 Mediterranean Eye (zt31415)

The simplicity and graphic clarity were found positive. However, the project failed to have a strong approach to the subject of the competition *“power of architecture”* and therefore unanimously eliminated.

05 ARASTA (zt50634)

Attempt to add value to a city was found valuable. However, the proposal fell short of a strong solution and therefore unanimously eliminated.

07 CONSERVATION, APPLICATION, AND RESEARCH CENTER IN BALAT (zt14641)

The analysis of the site and the way the problem was defined was found positive. However, the proposal lacked a strong architectural execution and therefore the project was unanimously eliminated.

09 RESILINE (zt11045)

The concept idea was found very strong by some of the jury members. However, since a strong architectural execution was missing, the project was unanimously eliminated.

12 PROCESS (zt95638)

The concept idea was found very strong by some of the jury members. However, a strong architectural execution was missing, thus the project was unanimously eliminated.

14 (Mecidiyeköy) (zt10377)

Attempting to find a solution to an urban problem and the approach of forming space through nature was found valuable. Since a strong architectural execution was absent, the project was unanimously eliminated.

19 The Return To The Self Center (zt12292)

The proportion of the masses proposed, the external spaces defined by these masses, and the scale of the proposal within the city were all found promising about the proposal. However since the proposal failed to address the competition subject, it was unanimously eliminated.

38 DESTROYING BORDERS (zt11001)

Rethinking the concept of borders and intending for it to become a meeting platform -rather than a wall that separates people- was considered to be a strong idea. However, being positioned in an open

field, the proposal itself was found to become a border, conflicting with the idea of destroying borders. Thus, the entry was unanimously eliminated.

40 STEPPE (zt13110)

The element of playfulness being combined with use was found positive. Since the proposal lacked context, the project was unanimously eliminated.

46 Geido (zt92130)

The proposed spaces in this project had certain qualities, however, each journey should be guided/directed and ended with a proposed solution. Since this project was missing a solution it was unanimously eliminated.

56 Visible/invisible (zt17856)

The shadow and different tones of light it casts, allow visibility and non-visibility, and the graphical quality was promising. Since the architectural proposal element was missing, the project was unanimously eliminated.

57 The Cube (zt13569)

The proposed geometric language within the presented topography was found impressive. However, the scale of the structure was considered out of proportion. The project was also found to lack a strong proposal for the usage of the inner space and therefore was unanimously eliminated.

60 Reminder (zt07143)

Considering ruins as architectural spaces that preserve our memories was found to be a strong idea. However, since an architectural proposal was missing, the project was unanimously eliminated.

65 Flofe (zt12061)

The way of approach to the historical texture was found positive. Since it was lacking a strong architectural execution, the project was unanimously eliminated.

After the elimination of the above 16 projects, the remaining 13 projects were voted to proceed to the third evaluation round.

Third Evaluation Round – Final Prize Ranking :

The jury mutually agreed to combine the final elimination and ranking in this round. Each jury member voted for three projects as their choice of the award group, without stating any ranking.

- Not receiving any votes, projects **15** (zt01933), **17** (zt30507), **21** (zt82074), **31** (zt74238), and **58** (zt99001) were eliminated.

The brief justifications for the elimination of those 5 projects are below:

15 Oblivion (zt01933)

The presentation was found culturally sensitive and alluring. Analysis played a bigger role than the actual proposal, and the presented material lacking hierarchy made the project very difficult to understand. Therefore, the project was unanimously eliminated in the third round.

17 Speck (zt30507)

Bringing concepts of visibility/invisibility and light/shadow to the urban space, framing views, and graphical quality were positive notes on the project. The jury expected a poetical effect to arise from such a proposal but subsequently determined that it was missing. As such, the project was unanimously eliminated in the third round.

21 Reverse (zt82074)

The playful, utopian approach together with promising graphics was considered positive. However, the project overall was found to be unclear in its intention. The project was unanimously eliminated in the third round.

31 Encountering Within: A journey through unnoticed (zt74238)

The attempt to build a city garden was found positive. Despite the different materials and patterns adding richness, the multiple spaces/images lack to form a 'whole'. The justification behind the presented journey was also considered to be missing. Therefore, the project was unanimously eliminated in the third round.

58 revival (zt99001)

Defining a problem at an urban scale and the attempt to solve it was valued. However, the solution was found too diagrammatic. Thus, the project was unanimously eliminated in the third round.

The following projects received one or more votes in the third round of voting:

- **06 Cilga** (zt30512) received 2 votes, one vote each from Kaya Arikoglu and Emre Arolat.
- 08 Mixed-Income Housing** (zt13515) received 1 vote from Noah Bergman.
- 10 Stratum** (zt22146) received 2 votes, one vote each from Emre Arolat and Zeynep Onur.
- 16 Floating Water Library** (zt13271) received 2 votes, one vote each from Ozlem Taskin Onen and Noah Bergman.
- 24 Tales of Woe** (zt37921) received 1 vote from Ozlem Taskin Onen.
- 25 deep I REAL** (zt34608) received 1 vote from Zeynep Onur.
- 33 Tempus** (zt25329) received 1 vote from Kaya Arikoglu.
- 45 knitting** (zt02107) received 5 votes, one vote each from Kaya Arikoglu, Emre Arolat, Noah Bergman, Zeynep Onur, and Ozlem Taskin Onen.

Accordingly, **45 knitting** (zt02107) was awarded the **1st prize**.

Projects **06 Cilga** (zt30512), **10 Stratum** (zt22146), and **16 Floating Water Library** (zt13271) were re-evaluated and voted for the 2nd and 3rd prizes.

Voting results for the 2nd prize are as follows:

06 Cilga (zt30512) received 2 votes, one vote each from Kaya Arikoglu and Ozlem Taskin Onen.

10 Stratum (zt22146) received 3 votes, one vote each from Emre Arolat, Zeynep Onur, and Noah Bergman.

16 Floating Water Library (zt13271) did not receive any votes in this round of voting.

As a result, **10 Stratum** (zt22146) was awarded **2nd prize**.

Voting results for the 3rd prize are as follows:

06 Cilga (zt30512) received 3 votes from Emre Arolat, Zeynep Onur, and Kaya Arikoglu.

16 Floating Water Library (zt13271) received 2 votes from Ozlem Taskin Onen and Noah Bergman.

Consequently, **06 Cilga** (zt30512) was awarded **3rd prize**.

The brief justifications for the eliminated 5 projects in the last round are stated below:

08 Mixed-Income Housing (zt13515)

The approach, graphic consistency, and the process of tackling a defined problem were found very valuable. However, rather than offering an architectural solution a process was presented, thus the project was unanimously eliminated.

16 Floating Water Library (zt13271)

Offering a balance between nature and construction, the relationship between water and the context was found positive. A strong architectural execution was lacking, however. Therefore the project was unanimously eliminated.

24 Tales of Woe (zt37921)

The difference between the sea and road levels -facts of the topography- were found to be ignored. Despite the thorough analysis and a good approach, the proposal was found too generic and therefore unanimously eliminated.

25 deep I REAL (zt34608)

The project was considered to achieve the sense of emotion and gravitas of what it's trying to achieve; the journey of a coal miner. It was also praised for its graphical quality. However, due to the lack of strong architectural execution, the project was unanimously eliminated.

33 Tempus (zt25329)

Despite the strong image it displays, due to the lack of a clear interaction with the urban context, over articulation of the façade, not proposing a clear experience either inside or outside of the structure, treating the tree(s) almost as an artifact, and not providing any space to interact with it (them) were the reasons for the project to be unanimously eliminated.

Awarded Projects and brief justifications are stated as follows:

06 Cilga (zt30512)

Attitude towards nature and landscape was found positive. The beginning and the end are clearly defined as they should be in a journey proposal. The relation between inner and outer spaces, and the spatial qualities were considered strong. Overall, the design was found elegant and sophisticatedly presented. Most importantly, the project is able to bring forward an argument on the “*power of architecture*”. The project was given 3rd prize by receiving the majority of the votes (3-2).

10 Stratum (zt22146)

This infill project in an urban setting was found to have a powerful architectural impact due to its multiple physical and emotional layers, and spatial qualities. The functional concept and the variety of spaces it generates, the way these spaces form a simple yet elegant composition were highly valued and considered as a strong proposal to the “*power of architecture*”.

The project was given 2nd prize by receiving the majority of the votes (3-2).

45 knitting (zt02107)

Reclaiming an open mine by transforming it into a livable space while keeping the traces of the carved land, not attempting to turn the setting into a green space -which would have negated the quarry, was found brilliant. Creating a strong architectural language while blending into its context was seen as a poetic touch on a wild land. The project was considered a strong proposal to convey the “*power of architecture*”.

The project was voted for the 1st prize unanimously.