
Open International Ideas Competition Building for Bouwkunde

Report of the jury meeting, January 14-15, 2009 in Delft

The end of something, the start of something new - beginning the jury process

The jury meeting for the Building for Bouwkunde Open International Ideas Competition was held on January 14-15, 2009, at a most appropriate venue: a former laboratory of Delft University of Technology. Until 2008, this building served as the University Museum, housing both Delft University of Technology historical collections and temporary exhibitions. The museum's large hall, with its impressive skylights, offered an inspiring space for the vast exhibition of the 466 competition entries, and subsequently for the lively, in-depth jury meeting discussions.

Liesbeth van der Pol, Chief Government Architect of The Netherlands and chair of the jury, welcomes all jury members, and specifically the international jury members who travelled from afar to be present at this historic moment for the future of Bouwkunde (Faculty of Architecture) in Delft. Sadly, due to illness, the dean of the architecture faculty and member of the jury, Wytze Patijn, is unable to attend the jury meeting. Ms. Van der Pol recalls the tragic events of May 13, 2008, when a devastating fire destroyed the characteristic Bouwkunde building designed by architects Johannes Hendrik van den Broek and Jaap Bakema. In the immediate aftermath of the fire, Dean Patijn and his team undertook great efforts to quickly relocate the faculty and allow its educational activities to continue unabated, as well as to begin contemplating a longer term relocation solution for the architecture faculty. Unquestionably, the loss of the faculty building and its many valuable collections was a severe blow, yet rising from the ashes was a growing sense of optimism that this was also an opportunity to create something new. Soon after the fire, the Building for Bouwkunde Open International Ideas Competition was initiated. The competition was launched at the Venice Biennale on September 13, 2008, exactly four months after the fire.

In a first discussion, the jury members agree that the task of this jury involves more than merely selecting a winner from the 466 competition entries. The outcome of the competition should be more than a contribution to the programme brief of the project competition. Instead, the overwhelming amount of ideas should stimulate a major discussion about ways of creating a school of architecture. Indeed, this competition's goals are to stimulate critical reflections and debate, to encourage young architects and students to be actively involved in re-thinking their faculty, and to promote research by design. The jury members agree that the open character of the brief, which has only limited restrictions and allows both students and architects to enter the competition, has resulted in a high level of creative production, breathing an atmosphere of energy and positive thought. Also, the jury members agree that not only the prize winners, but also a significant number of the other good entries should become part of a public debate, for example by means of an exhibition or publication.

The jury members subscribe to the three established criteria, which have been formulated as follows:

1. Visionary power, in the context of which the jury will focus on the originality and innovative character of the sketch design, including the area of sustainability.

2. Architectural quality, in the context of which the jury will review the spatial composition, the incorporation in the urban environment, the expression and materialisation, and the consistency of the sketch design.
3. Economic and ecological viability, in the context of which the jury will assess the functionality and feasibility of the sketch design.

A first impression of the entries

On the first morning of the two-day jury meeting, the jury members are given time to individually view all 466 competition entries, as exhibited in the hall of the University Museum. In order to somewhat organise the large number of entries, a team of Bouwkunde staff members has prepared a typological categorisation, which allows for a more structured viewing of the entries. Naturally, this pre-selection does not imply any rating in terms of the quality of the entries, but rather merely serves as a helpful organisational tool in the initial stage of the jury process. During lunch, the jury members share their first impressions.

Each jury member is impressed by the quality of the entries, as well as by the amount of work that has gone into the design and presentation. It is clear that many good architects and architecture students have contributed to this competition for a new Bouwkunde, and the energy expended in creating these designs is palpable as one walks among the many entries. Taken altogether, the competition entries seemingly offer a rich catalogue of the current state of architecture. The question of whether this indeed shows the *Zeitgeist* of architectural design, as well as ideas on architectural education, is enthusiastically discussed. The international jury members note the presence of a certain number of 'Super Dutch' entries, revealing a recognisably Dutch approach to architecture that became world renowned in the 1990s.

The highly skilled presentation of many entries gives rise to a discussion about the balance between conceptual qualities and the readability of presentation. Indeed, in such a sea of entries, quality of presentation is a key factor for being noticed. Yet, oftentimes too large a leap is made from idea to building form. Ideally, the quality of the presentation encourages the viewer to take a closer look at the project. The ensuing lively discussion about the balance between conceptual strength and quality of architectural representation continues throughout the jury meeting. The jury criteria help to give equal attention to visionary power, architectural quality, and economic and ecological aspects. The jury members agree that the winning entries should embody conceptual quality and representation, idea and spatial elaboration, and vision and design.

The entries frequently address the theme of sustainability. The jury is encouraged by the fact that so many designers are conscious of the environment. Sustainability however is more than simply a term, and thus the jury sets itself the task of taking a position in defining what sustainability could mean and how it could be measured. Another recurring theme is architectural education: many entries take ideas about flexibility or even mobility in future education as their starting points. Some entries empower students to modify their learning environment. Remarkably, the entries often

mention the possibilities for social interaction, both as an experienced quality of the former faculty building, and as a future quality to be achieved. The entries often refer back to the former Bouwkunde building, sometimes by referring to its shape or materiality, and sometimes by re-interpreting parts of the building, such as the public 'street' on the ground floor. Remarkable is the fact that a majority of the entries use the former faculty site for the new Bouwkunde building. Nevertheless, a significant number of entries propose using other sites on the Delft University of Technology campus, and others even question whether the new faculty building should even be in the city of Delft. Only a small number of entries propose the re-use of other existing buildings.

Selection of entries in the first round

After these first impressions, and only after each jury member has had the opportunity to view each entry in detail, the jury members collectively take a long tour through the exhibition hall past all the entries. It is at this time that the jury members propose entries for further discussion, with those entries being set aside for more in-depth discussion the following day. The aim is to conclude the first day with a selection of 50 entries for consideration in the second round. During the afternoon session, however, it becomes apparent that more than 50 entries have challenged the jury with their statements. While not fully answering to the three criteria of the competition, some projects do indeed succeed in presenting an intellectual statement that the jury deems very valuable. For this reason, in addition to the 50 entries designated for the second round, the jury also selects the following 16 entries to be specifically mentioned in the jury report as valuable entries in terms of the themes and ideas they address.

3275 BK SUPERMARKET

This entry presents the architecture faculty as a marketplace, where consumer-students can add bits and pieces of knowledge and skills to their carts. Using the contemporary typology of the supermarket as a model for education is a provocative statement. While a few other entries also present a similar idea, *BK SUPERMARKET* does so in the most challenging way.

3386 Universe-City

This proposal departs from a larger conception of the universe and sees chaos as something to be organised, and then once again reverted to. The faculty is seen as a container of a diverse and dynamic program. The construction of the building is regarded as a key organising element. Despite its somewhat immature elaboration, the jury appreciates this approach, also in terms of its structure.

3524 A University Bonded

This entry remains on a diagrammatic level. However, on an urban scale the project takes a very interesting position, choosing a central location on the university campus for the new faculty, a site situated between the faculties of Civil Engineering & Geosciences (CiTG), Electrical Engineering, Mathematics & Computer Science (EWI) and Mechanical, Maritime & Materials Engineering (3mE),

thereby allowing for more cross-pollination between faculties, and making the campus park more lively.

3538 tu,,,,,delft_(blurring education)

This entry uses a pixel-version of the old faculty building in flames to present an intriguing vision of a blurring faculty of architecture, with plans, sections and perspectives partially fading away. This idea however is not developed, and the reference to YouTube videos does not make the entry more accessible.

3621 Column Mountain

Column Mountain is an intriguing entry, showing a fragile image of transparency in what is conceived as a family of towers with small courtyards in between. The design is visualised in a very appealing way.

3738 DCC 438953

This entry takes mobility as a starting point. At the old site of Bouwkunde, there will be nothing more than a computer server. The real education of Bouwkunde takes place around the world, spread across various locations in Delft, London, Beijing or MIT. It is a challenging idea, but the jury presupposes the necessity of a physical place.

3746 'building building'

At first sight, this proposal looks like a humoristic interpretation of the Tower of Babel. The building is conceived as a '*Gesamtkunstwerk*' (complete artwork), in which the building is built over the years, meanwhile developing the building profession. It is an interesting philosophical statement, but the design of the building itself seems too strict for its own ambitions.

3796 interwoven/stitched

This entry takes the metaphor of sewing practice seriously, revealing a textile-like pattern of spaces and groups that is woven together in a large surface and stretched out over the campus park. The scheme looks promising, allowing for a variety of public and collective spaces within the structure. Architecturally, however, the scheme remains unelaborated.

3809 The Trinity of Bouwkunde

The street of the old Bouwkunde is often mentioned as a crucial space for the Bouwkunde community. This entry takes that notion a step further, proposing the concept of the street on three levels: the 'intellectual' street in the building, the 'scientific' street in the city, and the 'virtual' street on the Internet.

3873 UTILE DULCI

UTILE DULCI takes an integral approach to sustainability as its starting point. It presents three components: a public landscape, a student space 'village', and a teaching tower with workshop spaces and offices. A long-term durable shell is paired with more flexible and adaptable technological solutions. The jury appreciates this entry for its realistic and integral approach to issues of sustainability, rather than for its architectural quality.

3953 Bouwkunde goes Rotterdam

This entry proposes moving Bouwkunde to Rotterdam. Thus, it lacks interactions with other faculties, but the entry proposes to tap into existing sources, such as the NAI, Berlage Institute and various museums. The paradox being pinpointed here is that of Bouwkunde being located in Delft, while the urbanity of a city like Rotterdam is in fact the subject of study. Part of the educational program is realised in a main faculty building, situated next to the NAI, while the rest of the program is spread across various locations in Rotterdam.

4053 Educational Landscape

This project strikes a balance between an urban and a rural approach: urban through the high-rise section, rural through the ground floor landscape of greenhouses and outdoor spaces. Among the entries that focus on urbanity, this entry acknowledges the perception of the architecture faculty's peripheral position at the far end of university campus.

4079 PLUG-IN faculty of architecture

Even though this entry presents a strategy that does not include a convincing architectural elaboration, its point of view is challenging. The idea of time, and therefore of possible changes, is seriously addressed. The scheme offers a way for the faculty to organically grow its way into the campus, to grow bigger, but also to decrease.

4104 Backdrop

In this proposal, sustainability is paired with flexibility. The building offers room to expand and contract. Openness is the key to achieving a space for education and discussion. The architectural design offers a promising starting point, but remains too schematic.

4128 DO IT YOUR(S)DELF(T)!

This entry takes the faculty fire as an opportunity to rethink academic education. The building becomes a superstructure, adaptable by its users: the students. A modular grid makes various combinations of spaces and programs possible.

4284 Sky Studios

Sky Studios is one of the proposals where large floor areas provide a certain degree of flexibility in use. The design consists of two large volumes, one of which is hovering above the site, containing the studio spaces. The spatial configuration offers an interesting way to respond to the site.

The second round

The second stage of the jury process begins with an individual round. Each jury member spends hours closely studying the 50 projects selected for the second round. The panels of these entries are now presented collectively in the University Museum's main hall. Also, each entry and its accompanying texts have been printed on A3, allowing the jury members the option of studying the entries while seated at the reading table. After each jury member has had sufficient time to study the second round entries, the jury gathers for a group discussion. The jury members agree that the 50 nominated entries are all extremely worthwhile, while also adding their regret that all these entries cannot be more extensively discussed in the final jury report. The 50 entries present a wide spectrum of possible approaches and challenging architectural proposals. When looking at the selected entries, a number of recurring themes emerge. While acknowledging that many cross connections between the various themes exist in many proposals, the jury report of the second round is structured along these themes:

- Sustainable and technological innovations
- Dynamic landscapes of education
- Generators of social interaction
- Out of site: the faculty as a mobile community
- Visions on future educational concepts

Sustainable and technological innovations

The competition programme states that the design for the new building for Bouwkunde should display 'intelligence in its technical elaboration and serve as an example in the area of sustainability'. During the jury meetings, these themes are a source of lively discussion. How to measure sustainability? Does a design proposal with green walls and photovoltaic cells automatically score high on the sustainability criterion? Or could a more generic building, which is flexible in use, also be regarded as sustainable? The entries proposing to re-use existing buildings, or even not to build at all, might also be ranked high on the sustainability scale, as, indeed, construction work normally puts enormous pressure on the use of energy and material, and produces substantial amounts of waste. Technological innovations are not regularly seen among the competition entries. Moreover, construction is a key feature in only a few proposals; consequently, the jury expresses its concern about the role of construction in today's architectural education. In the second round, however, the jury does select a few entries that stand out in terms of their sustainable and technological innovations.

3222 Power Source

The idea behind this proposal is strong and provocative. Its somewhat science-fiction-like presentation does attract attention. In the accompanying text, the story of a matrix is used to illustrate how this new building generates power for its inhabitants, as well as for the campus.

3433 SWELL

This proposal integrates water and land in a radical building with strong landscape features, providing a nice balance between soft and hard. The picture recalls the works of Schinkel. The open space has a fascinating spatial quality. However, the ground plan, which blocks connections to the rest of the campus, seems too fixed for the intended freedom.

3949 Building as a Resource

This entry distinguishes different levels of sustainability in a well-explained vision. The project departs from 'nine sustainability aspects and their integration into the programmatic demands'. The proposal however does not result in a convincing architectural quality.

3452 ANIMAL ARCHITECTURE

This project stands out because of its integration of construction, skin, organisation and sustainability. It regards the building as an organism, whose layered skin is very important for climatological control. The main body is constructed with a 'vierendeel' structure, and from the ground floor, which functions as a large Bouwkunde Plaza, this body is lifted by constructive stairs.

3951 REBIRTH

The proposal stands out as one of the few examples among the entries that uses construction as a starting point. The structure generates three types of spaces that could organise the faculty. The project however is underdeveloped and fails to answer the specific questions posed for the competition.

Dynamic landscapes of education

Instead of proposing a design for a single building, a number of entries seriously consider Bouwkunde's relationships to its environment. In some cases, this results in an almost landscape-architectural design. Landscape is then seen as a quality of openness, on which architectural education can flourish. In other cases, the connections to other faculties are seen as opportunities to enrich the education at Delft University of Technology. As argued in some entries, the existing urban fabric also extends beyond the campus, proposing an extension of the physical presence of Bouwkunde to a larger urban network.

3794 Interdisciplinary Architecture

This entry takes the Mekelpark literally as a landscape of education, in which first-year students start in front of the main auditorium, before gradually moving along the park towards the old Bouwkunde site, where the final years of the curriculum are fulfilled.

4111 TECHNO MILE

Similarly, *TECHNO MILE* uses the Mekelpark as a means of strengthening the connections between the various faculties of Delft University of Technology. Connectivity, interaction and accessibility are important notions in this proposal.

3664 LET MEKELWEG GET IN

This project makes a nice connection to the surroundings, culminating in a meeting between landscape and a built volume. This openness towards the surroundings is seen as a quality that naturally provides the spaces of the faculty with daylight, as do the patios.

3954 untitled

Also in this entry, the Mekelpark is used as a built connector between different functions on the campus. The ceiling above the ground level is curved, giving way to outdoor connections between faculties.

4187 Dockyard

In *Dockyard*, water is used as a design instrument. On the scale of the campus, water clearly marks the Bouwkunde site. On the level of the building, water provides both space for reflection and interesting spatial distances. The laboratories and workshops are placed under the water level, whereas the library, restaurant and studio spaces all look out on the interior pond. The sculptural design is both iconic and fragile.

4199 Bouwkunde_Guerilla embedded in urban fabric

Bouwkunde Guerilla is one of the proposals suggesting that the faculty can make use of existing buildings. This entry focuses on the historic city of Delft, in which churches, houses and so forth are used for various functions. Indeed, rather than a design proposal, this entry is a statement about new strategies.

3601 FEELING A VOID FILLING A VOID

This entry presents an arbitrary form, completely treated as a landscape. The design is closed and open at the same time. On the one hand, this could be seen as a quality, and on the other, the statement 'Any form is possible' in the accompanying text also reveals the lack of an architectural position.

4204 Mainstreet matrix

Mainstreet matrix presents a building with landscape qualities on the site of the former faculty. It is conceived as a low-rise roof landscape with a high degree of porosity, which allows streets and open spaces to be created within the building. A well-elaborated and interesting entry.

4368 The new bouwkunde is more than a building

In this proposal, the left over space on the campus is put to use, generating connectivity between faculties. On the one hand, this entry aims at mobility with its 'urban generator', while on the other hand, the neutral container offers flexibility.

4387 Le Radeau de la Méduse

This design, showing a dynamic landscape of linear elements, contains interesting spaces. Two shells are used in a design proposal that focuses on shared programs and studio spaces, while linear bands create a public lobby.

Generators of social interaction

In the competition brief, remarks were made about the 'social setting' that the old Bouwkunde faculty was renowned for. The new faculty might also need to accommodate a strong sense of community, and in this way not only be a physical, but also a social place. The jury is delighted to see many of the entries acknowledging the importance of such aspects. Some projects aim to incorporate urban elements, such as streets and a square, in the architectural design, while others propose different ways to meet and exchange. Rather often the projects refer to the qualities of the internal street of the old Bouwkunde.

3438 Connecting Building for Bouwkunde

The idea of connection to other worlds, such as construction and project development, by means of establishing relationships to other faculties is certainly interesting and provides an interesting concept of architectural education. The design of a collection of towers has a very urban feel, including other than merely educational functions and making connections to other uses, such as businesses and living. However, the towers might function as isolated entities.

3845 The Layered City

This well-presented entry, based on a grid structure, imparts a sense of déjà-vu with regard to 1960s architectural projects. The new Bouwkunde is seen as a dynamic building, both in its internal organisation and in its position on the campus. The grid structure is compared 'to a street plan of a historic city centre, where something is always happening'.

3198 NEW BOUWKUNDE STREET

Like a number of other entries, this proposal takes the old Bouwkunde street as a starting point. It re-invents this street both in the interior and in the exterior, thereby offering interesting spatial qualities.

3887 Playing Loop

Also here, the street of the old Bouwkunde is re-invented, becoming a bicycle loop. The biking routes through the building somehow render it a local project, invoking a joyful image of a dynamic Dutch school. The circular shape seems to hint at an 'iconic' architectural statement, but its elaboration does not result in a strong architectural quality.

3055 BOUWKUNDE RELOADED

This project refers to the old faculty building through its use of the former building plan as a section, which, although at first sight a somewhat fashionable trick, does result in an interesting section, with a ramp connecting the different parts of the building. The old Bouwkunde street is no longer limited to the ground floor, but cuts through the entire building. The jury considers this proposal as a creative way of dealing with memory, and appreciates the quality of the 3D representation.

3362 241

This entry is an intelligent and simple project, featuring a formula of two buildings in one. It is an example of a dynamic high-rise, in which sufficient attention has been given to issues of sustainability. The design proposal has potential for rich spatial development.

4095 Social Rock

This proposal's primary concern is space for social interaction. The building is visualised as a fleeting green rock above a transparent ground floor. Large open spaces offer a 'soft' program and a public square. A number of sustainability techniques are proposed, such as photovoltaic technologies and wind turbines.

4155 Design terminal

In this proposal, the social structure and the idea of interaction are well elaborated. It offers a dynamic conception of a school functioning as a terminal, where travellers arrive and depart. The organisational structure provides public spaces as part of the infrastructure within the building.

3413 THERE IS NO FRONT DOOR

This proposal, presenting an oversized roof creating a larger covered outdoor space, is appealing in the way it diffuses the boundaries of the faculty. The ground floor is seen as one big entrance space. In terms of construction and technology, the project is however unrealistic.

3188 the living building

This entry is a good example of the typology of a plinth combined with a high-rise volume. It overcomes the risk of too strong separations between the various parts of the building. The faculty is seen as a living body, in which 'play' is one of the key activities for learning and creating. Flexibility is created by using sliding doors and by avoiding fixed walls. A modular screen facade implies interactivity.

4293 Tram Tube Treshold

This entry refers to a number of Dutch architectural concepts, such as Aldo van Eyck's playgrounds and the Dutch 'Woonerf'. The common theme in these references is the activity taking place in space. The special feature of this design is a tram route running through the building, thereby connecting the activities inside the faculty to a much larger urban network.

4029 CLOUDS

The entry *CLOUDS* uses Japanese paintings as a source of inspiration. In the design proposal, the clouds are enclosed spaces, with a soft character to allow interaction with more open spaces. The panels show interesting diagrams and an attractive graphic representation.

Out of site: the faculty as a mobile community

The focus on mobility is a remarkable theme among the entries. In the near future, architectural education might be less place-bound, owing to new communication techniques and the possibility of travelling fast. A number of entries take this situation as their points of departure, presenting a mobile faculty of architecture.

4028 From TU Delft to Architecture

An appealing idea of a mobile community, where all activity occurs in train wagons. Although not a new concept, it is an interesting and provocative idea. This proposal beautifully combines the notions of global and local, and dynamics and concentration. While the jury members are tempted 'to jump on that train', they do question whether a future faculty could really function without a building.

3082 Infrastructural Flux

This entry departs from a very similar idea, but makes a combination with actual buildings. It proposes to use the existing rail system as a means of rendering part of the education mobile, while designating a number of vacated post offices and train stations for re-use as branches of the faculty. The jury states that this is one of the most radical proposals to escape from the confines of the campus. This scenario, in which the faculty explores taking a network approach, must be taken seriously. The project is a good manifestation of how such an approach could be spatialised. Also, the re-use aspect of this proposal is appreciated.

3076 Faculty for Pluripotent Architect(ure)s

This challenging entry suggests that it is not the building, but rather its content, that generates the 'icon of Bouwkunde'. A strategy of 'urban curation' is proposed as a means of connecting the new architecture faculty to the dynamics of the urban environment. By means of a multitude of provocative projects, this school searches for contact with its environment. The building is literally presented as a series of brackets, leaving open spaces in between for 'potential'.

3331 FROM RIVER ROTTE TO THE OCEAN

This proposal takes a radical stance, recalling the superstructures of Superstudio and Constant. The focus on infrastructure is an interesting theme, aiming to spread Bouwkunde's activity across the campus, while retaining one central core.

4168 a new school of architecture

Instead of a building, this challenging proposal offers a strategy. A neutral void is developed that can be adapted to different places in the world, thereby forming a 'neutral container of multiplicity'.

4306 Power by combining forces

This entry is seemingly a mix of two positions: one referring to the faculty as a mobile community, the other referring to the need for a point of recognition. The connection to the other faculties is appreciated as an interesting and important theme to consider. This interdisciplinary approach allows for fruitful exchanges between architecture and other sciences. Again, the jury discusses the strength of idea versus architectural quality. While the proposal's visionary power is clear and viable, it does lack a commitment towards design.

Visions on future educational concepts

Some entries stand out for their strong ideas about architectural education in the future. A theme often mentioned is that of flexibility: how does a new building take into account the changes that are likely to occur in educational systems over the years? A number of proposals divide the program into flexible and fixed functions; however, the jury fears that too much of a division between these two functions could work counterproductively. Other proposals present a radically new idea of architectural education, or question the autonomy of architecture, thereby advocating an interdisciplinary approach.

3419 {71}

In {71}, students are given a set of elements to use for building with their own hands. Other 'sets' of this proposal include 'green', 'functional' and 'recreational' subsets. A simple main volume with a large courtyard is proposed as a main building. The various elements can be located either in the courtyard or on other places on the campus.

4251 UNicity UNIlife

This proposal presents a very thorough study of university life and educational structures, stating that future career structures are likely to become much less linear than they are today. A new profile for the management and content of Bouwkunde generates different programmatic demands. Rather than a building, a new type of organisational structure for a university campus is proposed.

4263 learning framework

This project departs from an idea of learning processes as dynamic. The designers refer to the *Homo Ludens*, or 'Man the Player', as a learning figure. The design proposes a horizontally organised school, featuring transparent parts that connect to the world outside the building. The ground floor is the most public space, while physical and visual links are made to facilities in the basement and working spaces on the first and second floors.

4220 Natural'y Digital

An intriguing concept, in which the digital age is taken to the extreme. Not only the architecture school, but even the 'sustainable/ digital/ information architect' himself is designed by means of implanted memory chips.

3499 chameleon

Chameleon presents a well-elaborated concept of the architecture faculty as an institution that sells its events and activities to the outside world. The façades function as interactive screens that advertise the activities at the faculty. Inside, there is a pleasant mix of studio and office spaces, lecture halls and multipurpose rooms.

3448 Multiplicity

This entry claims that a faculty of architecture is by definition 'an integral part of the education'. The site is divided into different parts, allowing the various departments to each have their own part and their own architectural expression. Rather than one single architectural ideology, this entry therefore proposes the faculty to become an 'architectural EXPO'.

4068 DRAWER

This design proposal draws on a balance between a closed side and a flexible side. The fixed or closed side contains the office spaces, while the more open and flexible side is conceived as a set of drawers sticking out of the main spatial envelope. A long inclined square in front of the building offers the spaces for public interest.

4268 The Manual for a new Architecture School

This entry presents 'open source' as a method for both design and education. It does not offer a fixed design, but rather proposes rules and parameters for establishing a widely shared master plan with a richness of individual solutions.

4227 dochi

Schools of architecture should not be made by architects, claim the designers of this entry, which is presented as a mixture of a fairytale and a manifesto. A building should invite students to invent ways of inhabiting, and therefore the architecture should be no more than a supportive structure. The proposed structure, which claims to 'explore the end of architecture', provides freedom for appropriation and education within.

The final debate

As the next step in the procedure, each jury member votes for five projects, without any ranking. The entries with the most votes or with convincingly argued votes are thus nominated to receive the prizes and honourable mentions. Six projects (3251 A WORLD WITHOUT OBJECTS; 3237 GREEN-HOUSED CULTURE; 3784 Learning and Creating; 4124 BK-City, not a metaphor; 4324 Vertical Forum; and 4375 amalgam) receive a remarkably high number of votes. It does not take long for the jury to unanimously decide to nominate these six entries for the prizes. Two other entries (4097 POST IGNEM; 4205 Ego Eco-system) raise so much discussion that the jury decides that they also deserve to continue into the last round. Thus, these eight projects are chosen for the final jury debate.

4097 POST IGNEM

The entry, *POST IGNEM* (or 'After the fire'), leaves the footprint of the old Bouwkunde literally untouched, and instead re-invents it as a spatially interesting inner courtyard within a new structure. This new structure is composed in a very rigid, systematic manner by defining a number of simple architectural rules. Although the proposal does not contain any novelties in terms of sustainable techniques, it is very carefully thought through on this level. The patios allow for natural lightening and ventilation, the large roof can be used to gain solar energy, and the ground plan allows for flexibility of use.

The jury regards this project as a very thoughtful way of using the footprint of the old building as a tangible memory. The old Bouwkunde becomes a monument through its absence and presence in the new. This very intelligent proposal overcomes the risk of becoming too nostalgic through the architectural elaboration of the plan, which juxtaposes regular, small courtyards and the larger 'footprint' courtyard. While the spatial representation remains rather limited, the concept itself bears the promise of a spatially rich building.

The jury appreciates this project for its strong appeal to the memory of the old building, without falling into the trap of nostalgia. For this strong and simultaneously modest design proposal, the jury rewards *POST IGNEM* with an honourable mention.

4205 Ego Eco-system

In combining a sustainable approach with an idea of flexibility in education, this entry takes a radical stance toward ideological concepts for architecture schools, claiming that such examples (Bauhaus, and perhaps also the old Bouwkunde) are too dogmatic. Instead, *Ego Eco-system* focuses on 'the need for change and growth in a flexible building concept that stimulates transformation....' This idea of change and transformation is linked to the metaphor of a living organism, developing through its intrinsic relations, with the operating performances occurring within the structure. The design proposal merely focuses on the plan, whereas the project's spatial potential could have been expressed in a more detailed section. The plan's radical openness offers a challenging starting point, though the jury wonders if such a scheme would provide enough orientation. In order to function as a real study and work environment, it might need some clear points of recognition that structure the perception of the space. Indeed, the open plan, in which very dense and dynamic activity is suggested, is provocative and raises discussion about flexibility, rather than ideology, as a key factor in the design of a school of architecture. Meanwhile, contemporary society, in which networks play an increasingly important role, is also taken into account. The proposal thus succeeds in combining the various criteria. Owing to this entry's daring and well-argued position, the jury rewards *Ego Eco-system* with an honourable mention.

3784 LEARNING AND CREATING

The entry *LEARNING AND CREATING* attracted already in the first round attention through its rural character. It claims to be inspired by 'the European rural milieu'. Whereas most entries present an idea of the Faculty of Bouwkunde as an urban environment, this proposal takes a reverse position. This is a refreshing approach, actually acknowledging the peripheral, suburban position of the TU Delft campus. Indeed, many tasks of contemporary and future architects might even be situated in such suburban conditions. Meanwhile, the jury finds the architectural expression surprising for this function, with prototypical small houses that seem to give a totally different impression than that of an internationally renowned institute. The architectural concept is based on two levels: learning and creating. Learning takes place in a diversity of facilities on the ground floor, that can be seen as a continuous landscape. The separate houses are meant as private offices and studio spaces in which processes of creating take place. Technically, the proposal is well elaborated, taking into account construction, materiality, sustainable solutions and the phases of the building process.

For the jury, the village-like image raises discussion. Can Bouwkunde afford a 'provincial' expression or should it provide an answer to the 'urban' ambitions of Delft University of Technology? While the scheme might suffer from its fragmented character, a good balance between fragmentation and hierarchy can be achieved. In fact, the non-hierarchical spatial organisation of the project

provides very interesting spaces. The use of gardens is a subtle and attractive way of organising various activities. The design provides a stage for activities, rather than a strictly defined architectural form. This stage allows embracing future possibilities; it provides a flexibility to add different elements. The jury concludes that this is a very strong concept, with modesty in the message.

4124 BK City, not a metaphor

The project *BK City, not a metaphor* starts by praising the faculty relocation work done after the fire, stating that the process was 'critical and realistic in its scientific approach, pluralistic in its design methods'. The designers see this as a quality that deserves to be continued. The project proposes a strategy for gradually extending the current Bouwkunde site at Julianalaan by means of competitions. The designers also take into account the time such an extension process would take, and present a strategy that distinguishes the various phases. The entry displays a no-nonsense approach, which could be highly feasible in both economic and ecological terms. The graphic representation of possible solutions however does not totally succeed in illustrating the architectural richness that could result from this strategy, in which 'the value of plurality' is brought forward. Could this model of various extensions result in a coherent ensemble? Does the drawn geometry allow for a dynamic interplay between the existing building and future extensions?

The appreciation of the current faculty building on the Julianalaan and the realistic approach to departing from that situation is well understood by the jury. *BK City, not a metaphor* convincingly shows that this is a realistic option, which the faculty and university should seriously consider. The statement is well thought through and clearly formulated, taking into account both the architectural and urban scale. This proposal is highly appreciated for its important statement and strategic quality.

4324 Vertical Forum

This project, like a number of others, takes the street as a typology that allows for and generates encounters between people. Indeed, the architecture faculty's social aspect is seen as the driver for the project. The proposal refers to the Roman Forum as a place to meet and exchange: the faculty of architecture is seen as a place for debate. The various departments within the faculty are each given their own position, while mutual exchange is stimulated. Moreover, the proposal includes a critique on the current use of the Mekelweg. According to the designers of *Vertical Forum*, the Mekelweg has more potential than just being a transitional zone without programme. Instead of adding another volume to the series of faculty buildings situated along the Mekelweg, this design proposes a building sunken into the park. This offers sustainable heating and cooling solutions, and, moreover, generates more activity on the campus. The proposal also provides a radically new structure for Bouwkunde, in which presentation and concentration are seen as key activities in a faculty of architecture. The spaces in between rooms for concentration therefore offer a 'dynamic zone for continuous presentation and exchange of ideas'. The jury wonders however if this clearly defined organisation leaves enough space for free thinking and creativity? The graphic representation shows a chaotic, yet at the same time very inviting space, full of activity. The project clearly presents a vision and is well

elaborated. According to the jury, *Vertical Forum* offers a remarkably inspiring and critical view of architectural education, as well as of the position of Bouwkunde on the Delft University of Technology campus.

3251 A WORLD WITHOUT OBJECTS

This proposal looks back to existing projects and typologies, while proposing to literally use the Rotterdam shopping street Lijnbaan, which was designed by architect J.H. van den Broek in 1952. This street, measuring 500x50x5 metres, is projected onto the Mekelweg. The Mekelpark's programmatic void thus becomes filled with activities. This radical move results in an intriguing project, which is finely tuned into a building that can engage in different relationships with the street. While referring to Van den Broek, the images also strongly recall the projects of Superstudio. The accompanying text clearly states that the project is not 'new'. This is a controversial and daring position, questioning the position of the architect and of architecture today.

While clearly evoking the 'memory' of Dutch architecture, *A WORLD WITHOUT OBJECTS* has strong architectural qualities in and of itself. The first panel, which at first sight attracts the most attention, presents an image of silence that the jury finds beautiful. The jury does wonder if this silence is really something to strive for, since for a street to work something must happen on that line. Somehow, the silent image bears a promise that something will happen, as much as it offers a sense of freedom. On the second panel, the sections and fragments of the plan prove the possible spatial richness of the proposal. The structure offers freedom to develop, by providing a diversity of educational spaces along the street, such as lecture halls, studios, rooms for study and reading, but also for more social functions, such as a bar, restaurant and sports facilities. Despite the suggested freedom, the proposed spaces are far from neutral. The sketches show a spatial richness that is achieved by minor means, such as the use of roof lights and the different height levels of the various spaces. The library is designed as the only exception in the scheme: a 24-storey high triangular tower. In some places, bridges, connecting the two sides of the campus, traverse the street.

The jury is intrigued by this remarkable project and challenged by its provocative architectural statement. While thus providing fuel for architectural debate, the proposal is considered highly convincing in terms of the spatial qualities and richness in use that this project suggests. The jury awards *A WORLD WITHOUT OBJECTS* the highest possible marks.

3237 GREEN-HOUSED CULTURE

This proposal combines a greenhouse typology with a dynamic laboratory atmosphere. The greenhouse is not only an interesting spatial and climatological typology, but it also refers to a local characteristic: the Westland area greenhouses in the immediate vicinity of Delft, while simultaneously evoking large university laboratories. The proposal moreover offers a clear statement on sustainability, without exaggerating the architectural expression that often accompanies it. The production of energy by photovoltaic cells, the use of rainwater, the function of patios as vents, and the way the structure allows for a controlled atmosphere, are all convincingly integrated in the design.

The design indeed shows an integrated approach, in which sustainability, issues of daylight, energy and waste are naturally combined with social structures, routing and spatial qualities.

In providing a large, continuous public space, the social aspect of the faculty is taken very seriously, with a good, clear routing provided in an otherwise dynamic open space. A positive point is also its openness towards all sides, allowing relationships to be established with other parts of the campus. On the level above this large open space, a second platform provides a research and studio environment. Despite the low-rise and low-tech expression, the architectural design does provide a good image of the dynamics and innovative capacity of the university. The main space seems extremely inviting to all types of people, students as well as researchers and international guests. Placing the green, park-like spaces at the edges of the building, rather than conceiving them as central patios as one would expect, is a remarkable and very effective design decision. The scheme is clear and leaves enough flexibility for further elaboration in the next phase. The jury remarks that the materiality and detailing need specific attention, however, as there could be a risk for a too generic 'exhibition hall' character. For its integrated vision on educational, architectural and sustainable demands, as well as for its feasible design solutions, the jury awards GREEN-HOUSED CULTURE the highest possible marks.

4375 amalgam

The entry *amalgam*, like a number of other proposals, including *BK City, not a Metaphor*, departs from the existing university building on the Julianalaan that currently serves as the architecture faculty. Even though the Julianalaan building is intended as a temporary solution, the proposal for the faculty to remain at this site and invest in improving its facilities should be seriously considered. Indeed, instead of building a totally new structure, starting from the existing situation could be a wise strategy in these times of economic and ecological crisis. The idea of re-use could also then be seen as a statement made by the university to re-value and improve historical campus buildings, and thus enhance sustainability.

amalgam proposes to extend the Julianalaan building, combining the orthogonal geometry of the existing building with an expressive new architecture. The new parts are very carefully positioned, delicately establishing a relation with the existing building. The programmatic organisation is clear and, by avoiding dead ends and disorientation, helps to overcome the labyrinth-like character of the existing building. This is achieved by organising all public functions along a street, and by positioning the studio spaces and offices in the transversal wings. The street functions like a backbone, providing possibilities for interaction through public facilities, presentation and exhibition. The density that comes with enlarging the existing premises is dealt with through the use of patios, which provide daylight and outdoor spaces.

The jury regards *amalgam* as by far the most convincing of the entries that proposed using the Julianalaan building as a permanent solution. *amalgam* presents a clear, well-argued vision of the faculty of the future, and also offers a feasible design solution that convincingly shows that a

combination of re-use and new construction can result in a strong architectural identity, which is fitting for an internationally renowned and innovative architecture faculty. This proposal takes a courageous position in complementing the existing building with an architecturally strong counterpart. The jury awards amalgam the highest possible marks.

The decision

In the final debate on the nominated projects, some important observations come to the fore. Sustainability is seen as a crucial theme to seriously and creatively address. Re-use of the existing building stock is introduced as a tactful way of both accepting and improving existing architectural quality. The strength of the entries lies also in a new sense of modesty that seems to radically differ from the 'star' architecture that dominated a large part of architectural debate over the last decades. The designs do not impose themselves, but offer space for creativity, for development and for change, in such a way that it does not limit, but rather enhances architectural quality.

The jury unanimously states that three of the eight nominated projects are of a remarkably high quality and deserving of being awarded the highest possible marks: the entries amalgam, GREEN-HOUSED CULTURE, and A WORLD WITHOUT OBJECTS all take a clear stance in the discussion of what an architecture faculty of the future could be. They are well elaborated and provide architecturally challenging solutions. The three projects take different points of departure regarding the site, all of which are important statements for the university to consider when continuing with the next phase. A building on the site of the former faculty, such as GREEN-HOUSED CULTURE proposes, can offer a new and dynamic character to the old Bouwkunde site, while making new connections to other parts of the campus. The idea of appropriating the long empty Mekelweg for a new, linear organisation, as suggested by A WORLD WITHOUT OBJECTS, provides a totally new conception of the dynamic of the campus, while offering a challenging organisational structure for the new faculty of architecture. The re-use of the existing university building at the Julianalaan site, as proposed in amalgam, was considered a very strong statement, stressing the importance of appreciating existing values in social, physical, economic and sustainable terms. The jury considers the strength of the ideas and visions presented in these three entries to have equal importance for the discussion about the future of Bouwkunde. The jury therefore rewards the entries amalgam, GREEN-HOUSED CULTURE, and A WORLD WITHOUT OBJECTS with a first prize ex aequo. The entries Vertical Forum, LEARNING AND CREATING, and BK city, not a metaphor, are rewarded the second prize ex aequo.

The Building for Bouwkunde Open International Ideas Competition results

First prize (ex aequo, each 15,000 euro)

amalgam

Laura Alvarez, laura alvarez architecture, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

GREEN-HOUSED CULTURE

Marc Bringer & Ilham Laraqui, Laraqui-Bringer Architecture, Paris, France

A WORLD WITHOUT OBJECTS

Gijs Raggars, Gijs Raggars architect, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Second prize (ex aequo, each 5,000 euro)

Vertical Forum

Elsbeth Ronner & Mick van Gemert, Faculty of Architecture, TU Delft, The Netherlands

LEARNING AND CREATING

Olli Raila, Heikki Muntola, Heikki Riitahuhta, Mikko Jakonen & Eetu Arponen, Department of Architecture, University of Oulu, Finland

BK city, not a metaphor

De Nijl Architecten, Henk Engel, Erik van den Berg & Marius van der Meulen, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Honourable mentions (ex aequo)

Ego Eco-system

Marc Koehler, Martijn de Geus, Miriam Tocino, Stepan Havlik, Carlos Franco, Hans Smolenaers & Bart Popiela, Marc Koehler Architects bna, Amsterdam, The Netherlands;

Consultants: Peter de Bois (TU Delft/Hogeschool van Amsterdam) & Matthijs Leendertse (TNO)

POST IGNEM

Tom Haelvoet & Eveline Hanssens, Haelvoet-Hanssens Architecten, Wondelgem, Belgium

Afterword

When, after the final decision, the names of the contributors were revealed, the jury was pleasantly surprised, for among the winners were many young architects and even students. While the majority of the winning entries was by architects from The Netherlands, architects and students from Belgium, France and Finland were also awarded a prize or honourable mention in this competition.

Without hesitation, it can be said that the overwhelming number of impressive entries from many young architects and students from the Netherlands and abroad reveals the presence of a new generation of talented architects that is willing and able to contribute to an architectural production of high quality. The jury believes these results should encourage clients to open up their views to this potential, while attempting to overcome the contemporary barriers posed by regulation. The jury strongly recommends that the architects of the three winning projects are given a role in the next phase of realising a new building for the faculty of Architecture.

Ultimately, the winning projects of the Building for Bouwkunde competition encourage a consideration of new approaches for the future of Bouwkunde, and for architectural practice in general. In this sense, the projects not only form the result of a competition, but even more so, they offer a challenging starting point for a vibrant discussion.

Jury members

Liesbeth van der Pol	Chair, Chief Government Architect, The Netherlands
Rahul Mehrotra	Architect, Professor Department of Architecture MIT, USA
Yung Ho Chang	Architect, Professor and Head of Department of Architecture MIT, USA
Herman Hertzberger	Architect, Emeritus Professor TU Delft, The Netherlands
Kees Kaan	Architect, Professor, TU Delft, The Netherlands
Ole Bouman	Director of NAI, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Leanne Reijnen	Student Faculty of Architecture, TU Delft, The Netherlands
Herma de Wijn	Secretary, Architect, The Netherlands

Unable to attend:

Mark Wigley	Architect, Dean of Columbia University's Graduate School, USA
Wytze Patijn	Architect, Dean Faculty of Architecture, TU Delft, The Netherlands

Report of jury meeting:

Klaske Havik	Assistant Professor, Faculty of Architecture, TU Delft, The Netherlands
--------------	---

List of names belonging to the entries mentioned in the report

Regstr. code	Motto	Design team members	Company/ School	City company/ school	Country company/ school
3055	BOUWKUNDE RELOADED	Keeyong LEE; Nenad BASIC	KLNB architects	Paris	France
3076	Faculty for Pluripotent Architect(ure)s	Cem Kozar; Isil Unal; Begum Erol	Pattu	Istanbul	Turkey
3082	Infrastructural Flux	Jonathan Louie; Katherine Hogan		Syracuse	United States
3188	the living building	Alberto Iacovoni; Luca La Torre; Ketty Di Tardo; Pietro Cagnazzi; Clementina Gentile	ma0/ emmezero studio d'architettura	Roma	Italy
3198	NEW BOUWKUNDE STREET	Xinzheng Wang	North China University of Technology	Beijing	China
3222	Power Source	Peter Trimp; Brian Scott; Astrid van Vliet; Frank van Dongen; Willem Joost de Vries; Joseline Nieuwenhuijse; Jan Frehse; Laura de Faber; Pieter Bree; King Yen Lee; Mark Cunningham	T+T Design	Gouda	Netherlands
3237	GREEN-HOUSED CULTURE	Marc Bringer; Ilham Laraqui	Laraqui-Bringer Architecture	Paris	France
3251	A WORLD WITHOUT OBJECTS	Gijs Ridders	Gijs Ridders architect	Rotterdam	Netherlands
3275	BK SUPERMARKET	Ferdi Koorneef; Barthold M.T. Thijssen	TU Delft	Delft	Netherlands
3331	FROM RIVER ROTTE TO THE OCEAN (PASSING ALONG DELFT	José Alves; Juliana Corradini; André Almeida	FRENTES	São Paulo	Brazil
3362	241	Bernd Upmeyer	Bureau of Architecture, Research, and Design (BoARD)	Rotterdam	Netherlands
3386	Universe-City	Dwi Hergawan	PDW Architects	Jakarta	Indonesia
3413	THERE IS NO FRONT DOOR	Romi Khosla; Martand Khosla; Maulik Bansal	Romi Khosla Design Studios	New Delhi	India
3419	{71}	annapaola busnardo; luisa stevan	università di architettura iuav	venezia	Italy
3433	SWELL	Shin Noguchi	takenaka corporation	Osaka	Japan
3438	Connecting Building for Bouwkunde	Chris de Weijer; Robert Alewijnse; Harrie Hupperts; Carolina Sumares; Lenny Vink; Eva Stekelenburg; Harry Molyneux; visualisaties: AniMotionS	DP6 architectuurstudio	Delft	Netherlands
3448	MULTIPLICITY	Suzana Milinovic; Rufus van den Ban; Eelco van Grootheest	OPVIS	Rotterdam	Netherlands
3452	ANIMAL ARCHITECTURE	Monica Orozco de la Cruz; Moritz Melchert; Juan Carlos Vidals	slot	Mexico DF	Mexico
3499	chameleon	Paul Gheorghe Lazar; Lazar Florin Vasile; Moldovan Paul Mihai		Brasov	Romania
3524	A University Bonded	Jeroen Westgeest; Niek Kramer	TU Delft	Delft	Netherlands
3538	tu,,,,,,,,,,,,,delft_(blurring education)	Alessandro Bava	politecnico di milano	Milano	Italy
3601	FEELING A VOID FILLING A VOID	stéphanie bru	Bruther Architecture / Luxigon	paris	France
3621	Column Mountain	Satoshi Matsuoka	MATSUOKASATOSHITAMU RAYUKI	Tokyo	Japan
3664	LET MEKELWEG GET IN	Oscar Arce; Gonzalez; Carolina Feinos Moraza; Elena Mugica de la Morena; Natalia Vera Vigaray	ETSAM	Madrid	Spain
3738	DDC438953	Emre Can Korkmaz; Zeynep Ceren Erdinç; Irfan Ertis		Istanbul	Turkey

Regstr. code	Motto	Design team members	Company/ School	City company/ school	Country company/ school
3746	'Building Building'	Jos van Eldonk; Rogier Söhne; Pål Ringborg	Soeters Van Eldonk architecten	Amsterdam	Netherlands
3784	LEARNING AND CREATING	Olli Raila; Heikki Muntola; Heikki Riitahuhta; Mikko Jakonen; Eetu Arponen	University of Oulu	Oulu	Finland
3794	Interdisciplinary Architecture	Jeeyong An	GINSENGCHICKEN	New York	United States
3796	interwoven/stitched	Juhyun Kim	uj	New york	United States
3809	The trinity of Bouwkunde	Martijn Lugten	TU Delft	Delft	Netherlands
3845	The Layered City	Kwan-Yee Wong; Nico Wevers;		Den Haag	Netherlands
3873	UTILE DULCI	Koen De Boo; Raymond van Sabben; Vincent van Sabben; Robbert Jan van der Veen		Den Haag	Netherlands
3887	PLAYING LOOP	cho kyu jung	mooyoung	seoul	South Korea
3949	Building as a Resource	Paul de Ruiter	Architectenbureau Paul de Ruiter b.v.	Amsterdam	Netherlands
3951	REBIRTH	Edouard Ropars	ABINAL & ROPARS	Paris	France
3953	BOUWKUNDE GOES ROTTERDAM	Jonas Klock; Felix Heisel;Anna Nilsson;Laura Diestel	Universitaet der Kuenste Berlin	Berlin	Germany
3954	untitled	Daniel Zarhy; Avital Gourary; Natanel Elfassy		Tel Aviv	Israel
4028	From (TU) Delft to Architecture	Keith Streames; Celine Champion; Anne-Laure Cavigneaux; Rodney Eggleston; Jean Garcin; Farzin Lotfi-Jam; Sam Rice; Lauren Stellar; Luke Waldron	The United Front	Fitzroy	Australia
4029	Clouds	shuuichi sugimura; hiroyuki kakita;akihiko kunimoto;toshihiro okitsu;masayoshi nakanishi;yuuki tajima;naoki nomura;atsushi ishii	takenaka corporation	osaka	Japan
4053	Educational Landscape	Merten Nefs; Vanessa Grossman	Projetos Urbanos	São Paulo	Brazil
4068	DRAWER	Sandra Slepikaite; Grazina Novicka; Margarita Kaucikaite; Ruta Vitonyte	Vilnius Gediminas Technical University	Vilnius	Lithuania
4079	PLUG-IN FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE	Krzysztof Gornicki; Agata Kycia	TU Delft	Delft	Netherlands
4095	Social Rock	Andreas Angelidakis; Eirini Anthouli; Sotiris Vasiliou	Angelidakis Studio	Athens	Greece
4097	POST IGNEM	Tom Haelvoet; Eveline Hanssens	Haelvoet-Hanssens Architecten	Wondelgem	Belgium
4104	Backdrop	Erik Hallberg; Willem van Es		Goteborg	Sweden
4111	TECHNO MILE	Hans Goverde; Peter van der Helm; Dirk Jan Postel; Annemieke Bleumink; Wouter Deen; JanHein Franken; David Hess; Hiroko Kawakami; Daan Markus; Tomas van der Meer; Vincent van der Meulen; Mariska van Rijswijk	Kraaijvanger Urbis	Rotterdam	Netherlands
4124	BK City, not a metaphor	Henk Engel; Erik van den Berg; Marius van der Meulen	De Nijl Architecten	Rotterdam	Netherlands
4128	DO IT YOUR(S)DELF(T)!	Alessandro Bua; Panagiotis Gkoliaris	TU Delft	Delft	Netherlands
4155	design terminal	Willem van Es; Erik Hallberg	TU Delft	Delft	Netherlands
4168	a new school of architecture	Aristide Antonas; katerina koutsogianni; yannikos vassiloulis		Athens	Greece
4187	Dockyard	Mikko Liski; Kai Korhonen		Helsinki	Finland
4199	Bouwkunde_Guerilla embedded in urban fabric	Haiko Cornelissen; Paul-Eric Schirr-Bonnans; Runar Halldorsson	Haiko Cornelissen	Jackson Heights	United States

Regstr. code	Motto	Design team members	Company/ School	City company/ school	Country company/ school
4204	Mainstreet Matrix	Tait Kaplan; Tim Kunkel; Mary Jane Kwan; Ali Naghdali	Rice University	Houston	United States
4205	Ego Eco-System	Marc Koehler; Martijn de Geus; Miriam Tocino; Stepan Havlik; Carlos Franco; Hans Smolenaers; Bart Popiela; Consultants: Peter de Bois; Matthijs Leendertse	Marc Koehler Architects bna; TU Delft & Hogeschool van Amsterdam; TNO	Amsterdam	Netherlands
4220	Natural'y Digital.	Matejic Marko	University of Belgrade	Belgrade	Yugoslavia
4227	dochi	Arnaud Zein el Din	arnaud zein el din	Paris	France
4251	UNicity UNilife	Danniel Krüger; Tristan Lannuzel; Frans Dikmans		Berlin	Germany
4263	learning framework	Aron Bogers; Bert van Breugel; Adrienne Groeneveld; Pieter Keijzer; Niels Kranenburg; Rob Langeslag; Mark van der Poll; Jeroen Steenbergen	Inbo	Eindhoven	Netherlands
4268	The Manual for a new Architecture School	Kristján Örn Kjartansson	KRADS ARCHITECTURE	Reykjavik	Iceland
4284	Sky Studios	Angela Cox	Skidmore, Owings & Merrill	London	United Kingdom
4293	Tram Tube Threshold	Toshikazu Ishida; Hiroki OGAWA_QU; Munenori INOUE_TohU; Chihiro ISHII_TUDMSc; Goshi Matsumoto_QU; Yusuke MATSUTAKE_QU; Ryoma YANAGI_QU; Rikyu NAKASHIMA_QU	Tohoku university	Sendai	Japan
4306	Power by combining forces, by desintegrating, by disforming	Pou Wai Lei; Gloria Pouwai Lei	University of Waterloo	Cambridge	Canada
4324	Vertical Forum	Elsbeth Ronner; Mick van Gemert	TU Delft	Delft	Netherlands
4368	The new bouwkunde is more than a building	Yashar Ghasemkhani; Arash Mesbah	Design Core[4s]	Tehran	Iran
4375	amalgam	Laura Alvarez	laura alvarez architecture	Amsterdam	Netherlands
4387	Le Radeau de la Méduse	Jean Tebouret	Jean Tabouret Architect, OTO crew	Montpellier	France

