

JURY REPORT

for the International architecture competition for SCHEMATIC DESIGN
for a new building of Karin Dom Foundation

JURY MEMBERS:

1. *GEORGI BOGDANOV*
2. *MAYA DONEVA*
3. *ARCH. VICTOR BUZEV*
4. *ARCH. MARTIN HRISTOV*
5. *ARCH. BORISLAV GEORGIEV*
6. *ARCH. HRISTO STANKUSHEV*
7. *ARCH. ANETA VASILEVA*
8. *ARCH. FELIX YAPARSIDI*
9. *PROF. OSCAR EUGENIEO BELLINI*

PROJECTS RECEIVED: 174

TECHNICAL COMMISSION: Compliance checks were carried out by a technical commission of experts between 22 and 27 February 2020. The technical commission took under consideration all technical and functional requirements and specifications set in the competition brief. The prepared check-lists from the technical commission were provided to the jury.

JURY MEETINGS:

Close meetings:

- 29.02.2020 from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m.;
- 01.03.2020 from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.;
- 02.03.2020 from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.;
- 03.03.2020 from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.;

Meeting open to public and press:

- 04.03.2020 from 10 a.m.

Note:

Due to the extraordinary situation caused by the spreading of Coronavirus (COVID-19) in Europe with new hub in Milano from 26.02.2020 the jury member PROF. OSCAR EUGENIEO BELLINI was not able to attend in person the jury meetings, but he was in a constant communication with the rest of the jury through video calls and emails.

In addition, ARCH. ANETA VASILEVA was ill for the first two days of the jury meetings, but she joined the discussions through video calls for those days. On 02.03.2020 she arrived in Varna and joined the jury committee.

MEETING MINUTES:

On the 29th February, the jury members observed the plot and visited the current building of Karin Dom to get familiar with the activities and the environment where the organization operates.

The competition's organizers – arch. Yavor Panev and Tsveta Yotsova-Stoeva informed the jury about all the preliminary procedures. These procedures include the anonymization of the submitted competition projects and the technical commission checks. All the 174 projects had randomly assigned unique numbers. All of the projects were uploaded on individual computers for every jury member (Arch. Aneta Vasileva and Prof. Oscar Eugenio Bellini received them via email). The organizers showed a sealed opaque envelope, which contains the list with the unique numbers and their corresponding names of the participants. The organizers informed the jury members about the agenda of the meetings, the procedure for conducting the competition, the requirements and the evaluation criteria set in the competition brief. Every jury member received a copy of the competition brief.

On the first day of the jury meetings (29.02.2020) the jury committee decided the plan for the evaluation procedure.

The first step includes individual preselection of projects from each jury committee. Every project receives Yes (1 pt.) or No (0 pt.) for proceeding further to the 2nd round of evaluation.

The second step includes the calculation of the points. The projects with 2 and more points will be previewed and discussed by the jury committee in order to narrow down the number of projects which will proceed to the 3rd round of evaluation.

The third step includes printing all of the preselected projects and detailed discussion of their functional and technical parameters. If needed, additional measurements will be made in order to put all projects on even evaluation conditions.

The fourth step includes discussion of the finally selected projects and their feasibility with professionals from different departments connected to the building (such as fire and safety specialists, building engineers, energy consumption and sustainability experts) taking consideration of the five evaluation criteria.

On the first day of the jury meetings (29.02.2020) each jury member had made its own preselection of projects and gave short comments in electrical evaluation tables. At the end of the day all 174 projects were ranked on a temporary ranking from 1 to 174 based on the given points. The 174 projects were narrowed down to 91 projects. Those projects were the one with two or more points.

Ranking	No	SUM
1.	1712	8
2.	1734	8
3.	1278	7
4.	3082	7
5.	3913	6.5
6.	3928	6
7.	4978	6
8.	1451	6
9.	1877	6
10.	2397	6
11.	3011	6
12.	5048	6
13.	5365	6
14.	5437	6
15.	6063	6
16.	6439	6

17.	7023	6
18.	7328	6
19.	8629	5.5
20.	9002	5
21.	1563	5
22.	1581	5
23.	2052	5
24.	2190	5
25.	2267	5
26.	3244	5
27.	3334	5
28.	4963	5
29.	5478	5
30.	5576	5
31.	8472	5
32.	8771	5
33.	9160	5

34.	9642	5
35.	9989	5
36.	2745	5
37.	3711	5
38.	1163	5
39.	1456	5
40.	1779	5
41.	1957	4.5
42.	3050	4
43.	3361	4
44.	3715	4
45.	3850	4
46.	4542	4
47.	5392	4
48.	5489	3.5
49.	5494	3
50.	5612	3
51.	5933	3
52.	6299	3
53.	6520	3
54.	7285	3
55.	8320	3
56.	9414	3
57.	9692	3
58.	9959	3
59.	1326	3
60.	1666	3
61.	2090	3
62.	2191	3
63.	2448	3
64.	2845	3
65.	3312	3
66.	3625	3
67.	3696	3
68.	3918	3
69.	3924	2

70.	3975	2
71.	4008	2
72.	4209	2
73.	4451	2
74.	5403	2
75.	5455	2
76.	5559	2
77.	6250	2
78.	6346	2
79.	6483	2
80.	6559	2
81.	6720	2
82.	6955	2
83.	7621	2
84.	7945	2
85.	8392	2
86.	8959	2
87.	9511	2
88.	8200	2
89.	8616	2
90.	1527	2
91.	1645	2
92.	1821	1
93.	2240	1
94.	2880	1
95.	2983	1
96.	2998	1
97.	3442	1
98.	3492	1
99.	3558	1
100.	3587	1
101.	4353	1
102.	4382	1
103.	4733	1
104.	4821	1
105.	5459	1

106.	6171	1
107.	6697	1
108.	6740	1
109.	7070	1
110.	7299	1
111.	7680	1
112.	9545	1
113.	9655	1
114.	9858	1
115.	1125	0
116.	1568	0
117.	1986	0
118.	2531	0
119.	2871	0
120.	3110	0
121.	3158	0
122.	3720	0
123.	3817	0
124.	4082	0
125.	4113	0
126.	4173	0
127.	4200	0
128.	4646	0
129.	4928	0
130.	5167	0
131.	5202	0
132.	5238	0
133.	5298	0
134.	5304	0
135.	5426	0
136.	5504	0
137.	5529	0
138.	5596	0
139.	5650	0
140.	5716	0

141.	5791	0
142.	6008	0
143.	6172	0
144.	6360	0
145.	6437	0
146.	6779	0
147.	6812	0
148.	6971	0
149.	7294	0
150.	7297	0
151.	7306	0
152.	7329	0
153.	7502	0
154.	7536	0
155.	7777	0
156.	7888	0
157.	8389	0
158.	8443	0
159.	8551	0
160.	8570	0
161.	8631	0
162.	8752	0
163.	8883	0
164.	8935	0
165.	9017	0
166.	9038	0
167.	9066	0
168.	9192	0
169.	9193	0
170.	9290	0
171.	9461	0
172.	9678	0
173.	9710	0
174.	9837	0

On the second day of the jury meetings (01.03.2020) started with detailed discussion of pros and cons for each of those 91 projects. After the vote, the jury chose 19 projects which should proceed to 3rd round.

The number of the projects are:

1278
1712
1734
1779
1877
2190
2397
2745
3913
3928
5365
5403
5437
6063
6346
8629
8959
9414
9989

On the third day (02.03.2020) the meeting started with presentation of the selected 19th projects. They were printed and discussed by all of the jury members evaluating their functional program, visual presentation, sustainability, estimated cost for building and maintaining. As a result of the evaluation, the jury committee chose 6 projects for the final selection.

TABLE 1: Jury's Evaluation of those 19 projects

Project number	Jury's Comments
1278	Overall feedback: After careful evaluation for the jury was visible that the proposed project meets all criteria in a quality manner.

Criteria 1 Functionality

It is a compact building with plenty free space for outdoor activities not only several functions but is well organized with short connections. It is a three storey building with the main kids' related activities concentrated on the first two floors. The building takes full advantage of its compact form regarding covering the competition program via clever solutions to fulfill and build upon the guidelines.

Criteria 2 Sustainability

The surface to-volume ratio ensures high performance and low maintenance costs. Only the first floor is fully glazed which ensures connections with the surroundings. On the second and third floor all the windows are fixed and the only openable spaces are the wooden panels, which ensures safety, flow and economic efficiency. The project has a very performative and flexible structure which gives freedom to shape the room later on in terms of design. The building has a reasonable ratio between the opaque façade and windows. The façade solution is simple, but efficient and it enables energy efficient solutions without affecting the architectural qualities of the building

Criteria 3 Feasibility

The compact volume serves in favor of feasibility. Simple cladding structure, small parking garage which is precisely under the building and is very well organized. Efficient circulation. The project preserves the trees in most parts of the yard and plot since it uses only 25% for the actual building and saves the outdoors spaces.

Criteria 4 Exterior and fit in the surroundings

The team has put some efforts in placing the building within the environment around. The building occupies properly selected, according to environment and neighborhoods building, part of the plot, which ensures large enough South-East yard. The building is positioned in the Northern corner, which leaves big open space and easy access. The building has pedestrian access from the West, car access from the South and these accesses are easy, with shorter connections and well-divided

	<p>approaches leaving the yard unaffected The green buffer that is proposed is an adequate solution towards the open spaces and yard which is also multi-functional. Being so rational, functional and simple it is also contextual towards the simple late-modern environment. The use of glass on the ground floor creates good permeability and visual connections.</p> <p>Criteria 5 Interior Design Well organized shared space which creates children friendly environment and enhances the initial desire by Karin dom, opportunities for inclusion of children with special needs. We value highly the use of wood for glass partitioning, which is a good way; The interior design has many clever solutions which makes it very usable on every day basis. The horizontal order of materials creates a kids' friendly scale and the restrained colors plans complement this decision. Niches in walls around the atrium create spaces for rest and relax.</p> <p>The jury proposes the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for the team to find proper orientation for Montessori group (overall day group); - To find infrastructure for electrical system and HVAC decision that preserves the interior; - Please assess level of proximity and inclination of ramp; - To provide solution for sun-shading for the roof – automatic; <p>To ensure the additionally needed fire evacuation stairs and exits according to the local fire safety regulations</p>
5365	<p>Criteria 1 Functionality Two-store pavilion structure building which creates a series secluded spaces which meet the needs of the kid-friendly and inclusive environment. At the same time the project has no long corridors and provides balance between the proposed spaces and their inner connections. The pavilion structure creates proper inner court yard and kids' friendly scale. In this particular proposal there is adequate fencing and balance of volume -height of court yard which makes them more child-friendly and less isolated.</p>

	<p>Criteria 2 Sustainability The building has a reasonable ratio between the opaque façade and windows.</p> <p>Criteria 3 Feasibility The proposed building is a simple volume structure with ensures cost efficiency and sustainable approach.</p> <p>Criteria 4 Exterior and fit in the surroundings The building fits well with the surrounding low-rise dormitories and being a generic solution at first sight it is still a conflict-less addition towards the context. The building is well defined in engineering and construction aspects.</p> <p>Criteria 5 Interior Design A well-suited color palette creates a warm and welcoming interior and tranquille spaces without unnecessary stimulus (check later) for children with special needs. There is a good connection between the spaces and the inner courtyard.</p> <p>The jury proposes the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To consider the substitution of the wooden structural system towards a traditional concrete one due to cost efficiency; - To consider a better floor planning solution for the transitional spaces towards more flexible use; - To consider finding façade positions for rooms 2.5, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12; - To propose a car parking entrance from the only possible location indicated in the brief; - To propose an exterior shading system instead of the interior one; - To find space for the hydro-therapy unit on the ground floor;
8626	<p>Criteria 1 Functionality Although it occupies the entire plot it is still a compact</p>

building on mainly two floors with a rich variety of different interior spaces. It compensates the lack of one major courtyard with a sequence of smaller inner green yards. Creates a building with a lot of shared spaces which facilitates Karin Dom's intention to promote integration between the different kid zones. Interesting proposal of an amphitheatrical space.

Criteria 2 Sustainability

The project proposes the creation of several green spaces which improve the internal and external climate conditions. The building orientates its different spaces according to the sun and the context. Good natural ventilation. The expectable ratio between façade and gross floor area is not suited to allow an energy efficient maintenance of the building.

Criteria 3 Feasibility

A bold architectural gesture that will require budget optimization solutions. The chosen in-situ double layer concrete construction is very cost intensive and will lead in combination with the complex geometry to a complex execution process.

Criteria 4 Exterior and fit in the surroundings

The proposal creates a playful exterior that breaks the large scale and promises interesting journeys to the kids. The idea of the big villa stimulates the image for a children friendly facility.

Criteria 5 Interior Design

A series of interesting and playful kids' scaled spaces that educate and embrace variety of activities in a friendly environment.

The jury proposes the following recommendations:

- Analysis of overall lighting solution and further investigation of natural light possibilities
- To optimize corridor connections and to shorten the access especially on the last floor

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To double check the natural light possibility to pool area and the excavation of the pool courtyard to the southeast of the plot. - To ensure preservation of greater number of existing trees - The find space for the hydro-therapy unit on the ground floor; - To consider other more cost-efficient façade solution without losing the overall serene sustainable cladding systems than the current concrete architectural impression of the building one - To consider a lesser ground floor imprint. - To consider less transitional spaces
2190	<p>A radical solution proposing a cost-effective simple box with an interesting idea to put the parking space above the ground floor. The idea for a transformable first floor is a positive message of flexibility and possible future uses of Karin Dom.</p> <p>For the current use of the Karin Dom this disposition causes problems in terms of functionality and proves to not be practicable.</p>
2745	<p>A bold and fairy-tale architectural gesture with underlying functional rationality is beautifully represented in the proposal. Hidden behind the whimsical facades one finds a simple and compact volume that can easily meet the functional requirements and preserve the existing trees. Nevertheless, the positioning within the Eastern part of the plot, makes it for unfavorable North-Western yard. The proposal leaves less outdoor space for children and community gatherings and the proportion of the inner court yard could be improved. There is a number of functional compromises as it is. The chosen façade material does not meet the qualitative ambition of the whole proposal.</p>
6063	<p>A bold modular grid structure which creates a flexible and adaptable solution for the functional brief. A rich maze of different interior spaces offers warmth and appropriate</p>

	scale for the kids. Urbanistically the proposed building fits well into the existing neighborhood fabric. It poses a number of structural, fire-safety, cost-efficiency and other practical disturbances. The stiff grid results in over dimension of the circulation.
2397	The proposal fits children's needs. A well-constructed from the inside out proposal focused on the level of details. There is a clear lack of balance of attention towards the outside, exterior and façade in comparison with the inside and content of the building.
1712	Well researched pavilion structure creating rich internal spaces but also problems with the cost efficiency, energy efficiency and functional compromises.
9989	A simple solution to a complex problem with a terraced vertical exterior, but a deep atrium space which makes for an unpleasant ground floor. A cost-effective solution with little architectural identity to it. The exterior form finding results in an inefficient interior organization.
9414	Rich pavilion structure which makes a variety of controlled spaces but at the same time creates a number of functional cul de sacs. The chosen architectural appearance is considered inadequate by the jury members.
1877	Clean simple slab building which completes the existing ensemble of the South- West border of the plot. Simple inner organization is counter intuitively juxtaposed by an expensive façade solution. The proposal is in harmony with the natural environment.
3928	A well thought out pavilion structure, which offers an working functional solution, but at the same time there are long connections and unnecessary decorative elements which are put without mindset for cost efficiency, feasibility and energy-efficiency.
1734	Four level building which is situated in the South- East part of the plot, which creates an order court yard where

	less greenery is saved. The project creates a visible impression of an office building and there are no safety railings proposed for the windows.
8959	Clear and rationally organized space with high level of functionality rather hostile bland facades. It contradicts with the mission of Karin dom for transparency, openness and inclusion.
3913	Clear layering of the most program functions which suggest functionality of the processes within. Warm exterior and interior color palette and material selection which suit the purpose and mission of the building. The proposal offers unnecessary long connections.
5403	The proposal fits in the local environment. The proposal reflects and builds upon the analogy between Dom/House and Karin dom in relation with the cosiness and warmth of a family house. There is a clear residential appearance of the project which is misleading considering the public and social mission of Karin dom. There is a unnecessary division of spaces.
5437	Very thought through sensual organic sculpture in the park. There is an original approach towards form making is combined with a number of functional compromises and geometrical formalities.
1779	Simple and well insulated box structure which offers alternative attitude towards site organization and vehicle and pedestrian approach. The project benefits from the North West yard and positioning towards the East.
6346	Brave typological approach which comes with the vast occupation of the plot, offering a big terrace on the second floor. The schematic architectural expression goes against children-friendly environment.

On the fourth day (3.03.2020) the jury committee completed the voting and final ranking of the projects by choosing the three winning projects and decided the fourth, fifth and the sixth place to be honourably mentioned.

The jury meeting was closed with the final decision for ranking of the competition projects as follows:

First place - Project Nr: **1278**

Second place – Project Nr: **5365**

Third place – Project Nr: **8629**

Fourth place – Project Nr: **2190**

Fifth place – Project Nr: **2745**

Six place – Project Nr: **6063**

7	2397
8	1712
9	9989
10	9414
11	1734
12	3928
13	1877

14	8959
15	3913
16	5403
17	5437
18	1779
19	6346

20th Place: 3082

21st Place: 4978, 1451, 3011, 5048, 6439, 7023, 7328

22nd Place: 9002, 1563, 1581, 2052, 2267, 3244, 3334, 4963, 5478, 5576, 8472, 8771, 9160, 9642, 3711, 1163, 1456, 1957,

23rd Place: 3050, 3361, 3715, 3850, 4542, 5392, 5489

24th Place: 5494, 5612, 5933, 6299, 6520, 7285, 8320, 9692, 9959, 1326, 1666, 2090, 2191, 2448, 2845, 3312, 3625, 3696, 3918

25th Place: 3924, 3975, 4008, 4209, 4451, 5455, 5559, 6250, 6483, 6559, 6720, 6955, 7621, 7945, 8392, 9511, 8200, 8616, 1527, 1645

26th Place: 1821, 2240, 2880, 2983, 2998, 3442, 3492, 3558, 3587, 4353, 4382, 4733, 4821, 5459, 6171, 6697, 6740, 7070, 7299, 7680, 9545, 9655, 9858

27th Place: 1125, 1568, 1986, 2531, 2871, 3110, 3158, 3720, 3817, 4082, 4113, 4173, 4200, 4646, 4928, 5167, 5202, 5238, 5298, 5304, 5426, 5504, 5529, 5596, 5650, 5716, 5791, 6008, 6172, 6360, 6437, 6779, 6812, 6971,

7294, 7297, 7306, 7329, 7502, 7536, 7777, 7888, 8389, 8443, 8551, 8570, 8631, 8752, 8883, 8935, 9017, 9038, 9066, 9192, 9193, 9290, 9461, 9678, 9710, 9837

On the 4th of March a public press conference was held in the presence of the jury committee, media representatives, Karin Dom Foundation's members, competition participants, partners and guests.

Maya Doneva, as Karin Dom's executive director and jury member announced the ranking of the first three projects that received the highest score, namely:

In the first place is the competition's project with an individual number:

In the second place is the competition's project with an individual number:

In the third place is the competition's project with an individual number:

The competition's organizers handed Maya Doneva the sealed envelope which contains the list with the unique numbers and their corresponding names of the participants.

Maya Doneva opened the envelope and announced the names of the participants in the competition, whose projects are ranked on the first, second and third place, as follows:

First place - Project Nr: 1278 - UNAS Studio, Biliana Asenova, Sasha Chabaty, Germany

Second place – Project Nr: 5365 – Unio Denis Olegovich Antokhin, Nikolai Vladimirovich Bukhantsov, Galina Isaevna Sheveleva, Victoria Victorovna Dumanova - Russian Federation

Third place – Project Nr: 8629 - At Architecture, Avneesh Tiwari, Neha Rane - India

Fourth place – Project Nr: 2190 – architecture collective POV - Bozhidara Delcheva Valkova-Goranova, Matiya Peneva Gyaurova, Boria Emilov Tikvarski, Mike Steve Fritsch, Bulgaria

Fifth place – Project Nr: 2745 - collective NADA, Georgy Rachev Sabev, Antonina Tritakova, Azalia Sargsian, Bulgaria

Six place – Project Nr: 6063 - TUUNGOO ARQUITECTOS - Diego Penche Perez, Alberto Regues del Rio - Spain

The jury announced the numbers and the names of the rest of the participants in the competition.

The jury concluded its work with the final decision for the ranking of all projects, which participated in the competition.