



Book of Abstracts



Leeds School of Architecture, Leeds Beckett University

6TH INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIONS CONFERENCE (ICC 2016)

LEEDS UK, 27-29 OCTOBER 2016

**THE COMPETITION MESH: EXPERIMENTING WITH AND WITHIN
ARCHITECTURE COMPETITIONS**

LEEDS SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

LEEDS BECKETT UNIVERSITY

Under the auspices of the RIBA Competitions Office

THE COMPETITION MESH: EXPERIMENTING WITH AND WITHIN ARCHITECTURE COMPETITIONS

www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/icc2016

Following successful previous conferences in Stockholm (KTH Royal Institute of Technology 2008), Copenhagen (Copenhagen Business School 2010), Montreal (University of Montreal 2012), Helsinki (Aalto University, School of Arts, Design and Architecture 2012), and Delft (Delft Institute of Technology 2014), the purpose of ICC 2016 is to offer a window into current interdisciplinary research on the topic of architecture competitions. The series of conferences looks at competitions as a specific field of knowledge in order to understand the competitions' discourse and to question historical and current aspects, presuppositions, concepts and practices.

The 6th international Conference on Competitions (ICC2016_UK) focused on scrutinizing and *mapping* the concept of experimentation within architecture competitions; it asked for papers that addressed (and probably extended the list of) the following categories and aspects of experimentation:

Procedural: referring to competition types (public, private, open, by invitation, etc.). For example, what are the similarities and differences between public and privately-driven and independent organizations/entities competition procedures in terms of organizational frameworks, briefs, aims, publicity, target groups of participants and publics, records of undertaken procedures, and most importantly, how may they promote experimentation? What are the emerging frameworks that may be detected?

Social: referring to the impact of competition procedures in terms of the resulting buildings and structures. What kind of design problems are competitions concerned with and how do they specify and alter social aspects and context? In other words, how do competition-generated buildings/structures take up and/or experiment by altering the features of an existing context? Do they reinforce, re-shape or create new material-human-technical-technological assemblages? Are human attachments and relations in the form of communities, interested groups and other complex conglomerations, taken into account in competition briefs and resulting buildings and structures? Is there any intention to redesign *matters of concern*? Also, how do competitions promote and/or modify the status of the architectural profession and the role of the architect within current and past organizational structures of society?

Representational: referring to the representational 'idioms' used by architects and designers in contemporary design. How have these changed in relation to previous periods (as manifested in the framework of competitions), for what reasons and in what way are they currently being altered? How do competitions enhance, promote or follow changing trends in design representation and/or challenge the architectural representation of concepts or even produce representation-related concepts?

Political: referring on the one hand, to political structures (politics) & policies intertwined with competitions and competition-involved actors; how these have shaped decision-making structures corresponding to local and international architectural and urban design precedents? How historical, financial, ethical and political aspects have produced diverse

competition traditions in the past and how have they changed during the course of the last few decades. If the ‘political’ is understood on the other hand, in the context of current political theory as the ‘moment’ of change, how competitions have approached, questioned or enticed changing conditions in the past and are there any current trends in putting forward briefs, organizational structures, diversified actors, etc., that promote experimentation in order to re-orient the present? In recent years we have and continue to witness, a surge of competitions (or rather calls) which do not seek to produce a building or an architectural structure but aim instead to raise awareness and pinpoint current social, political, technological, etc., issues intertwined with the urban condition; these are usually initiated by independent entities and aim to entice experimentation by reformulating and resetting the very terms and conditions within which a problem is posed or arises.

It was the intention of the organizers to cover all aspects of architectural/design competitions’ experimentation and merge in the ICC2016 both a practice-oriented and theoretical approach to the subject by opening up the call for papers to independent actors/various entities as well as to professionals and scholars in the field. During the conference all voices will be heard and debate will be strongly encouraged around the history of competitions, their organisational, legal, political, social and conceptual framework, the role of clients and professional organisations and concerns that have been voiced about competitions. All of these issues will be put under scrutiny by the participating researchers and practitioners.

Dr **Maria Theodorou**, PhD (AA), architect ARB/RIBA, Fulbright visiting fellow (Princeton, 2005). Maria is the director and founding member of the independent School of Architecture for All (SARCHA) and a senior lecturer at Leeds School of Architecture. Her research, publications and teaching centers on ‘architecture and the political’ and she is currently co-editing an RIBA book on architecture competitions. She is the co-organiser of the *6th International Conference on Architecture Competitions* (ICC 2016) at Leeds and of the *Shadow Series* at the Architectural Association in London (2016-17). <http://www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/staff/dr-maria-theodorou>

Dr **Antigoni Katsakou**, PhD (EPFL), MArch (UPC), Dipl Arch (NTUA), architect ARB is co-author of the book *Concevoir des logements. Concours en Suisse: 2000- 2005* ([Composing Apartments. Competitions in Switzerland: 2000-2005], Lausanne: PPUR, 2008/2013). She has practiced and lectured in Greece, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom, and been a Postdoctoral Visiting Fellow at the Bartlett School of Graduate Studies (UCL, Space Group, 2012-2013). Her research interests comprise the following topics: design innovation in the framework of housing competitions, alternative versions of the Modern, architectural representation and its social meaning, geometry of the layout and its visual effects.

Scientific committee

Jonas Andersson

KTH and the Swedish Agency of Participation, Stockholm

Jean-Pierre Chupin

Université de Montréal

Antigoni Katsakou

Leeds School of Architecture

Magnus Rönn

KTH Stockholm

Torsten Schmiedeknecht

University of Liverpool

Maria Theodorou

Leeds School of Architecture

Elisabeth Tostrup

Oslo School of Architecture and Design

David Vanderburgh

Université Catholique de Louvain

Leentje Volker

Delft University of Technology

Organising committee

Maria Theodorou

Leeds School of Architecture

Antigoni Katsakou

Leeds School of Architecture

RIBA representative

Julia Davies

Business Manager, RIBA Competitions

Book of abstracts edited by

Dr Maria Theodorou

Dr Antigoni Katsakou

Proofreading

Professor Simon Morris

Graphic Design of Conference Logo

Dr Antigoni Katsakou

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Thursday, 27 October 2016	
8.30 – 9.15	Registration & Coffee
9.15 – 9.30	Welcome & Introduction
9.30 – 11.00	Keynotes: Aymone Nicolas (<i>Ecoterre, FR</i>) & Kristian Kreiner (<i>Copenhagen Business School, DK</i>)
11.00 – 11.15	Questions
11.15 – 11.30	Coffee break
11.30 – 13.30	Session 1 <i>Procedural Tactics</i> <i>Chair:</i> Antigoni Katsakou & Maria Theodorou (4 authors)
	Lunch break
14.30 – 16.30	Session 2 <i>Social Strategies</i> <i>Chair:</i> David Vanderburgh & Torsten Schmiedeknecht (4 authors)
16.30 – 16.45	Coffee break
16.45 – 18.15	Session 3 <i>Professional Procedures</i> <i>Chair:</i> Jonas Andersson (3 authors)
18.15 – 19.00	Nibbles and wine break
19.00	Film Screening: <i>The Competition</i> Q&A with the director Angel Borrego Cubero

Friday, 28 October 2016	
9.00 – 10.30	Keynotes: Eva Franch i Gilabert (<i>Storefront NY, USA</i>) & Jeremy Till (<i>Central Saint Martins, UK</i>)
10.30 – 10.45	Questions
10.45 – 11.00	Coffee break
11.00 – 12.30	Session 4 <i>Political Assemblages</i> <i>Chair:</i> Magnus Rönn (3 authors)
12.30 – 13.30	Roundtable RIBA – UIA with: Jerzy Gochulski (co-director UIA International Competitions Commission), Cindy Walters RIBA (Walters and Cohen), Roger Hawkins RIBA (Hawkins Brown), Bill Taylor RIBA (Robin Snell & Partners) <i>Chair:</i> Andrew Wilson (Head Leeds School of Architecture)
	Lunch break
14.30 – 16.30	Session 5 <i>Experimenting with the 'Social'</i> <i>Chair:</i> Jean-Pierre Chupin (4 authors)
16.30 – 16.45	Coffee break
16.45 – 18.15	Session 6 <i>Representation and Judgment</i> <i>Chair:</i> Elisabeth Tostrup (3 authors)
18.15 – 18.45	Roundtable Chairs of Sessions and Closure: ✓ Conclusions Experimentation ✓ The future of competitions ✓ Future research on competitions Closure: Lisa Stansbie, Dean, The Leeds School of Art, Architecture & Design
19.00	Conference Dinner

Saturday, 29 October 2016	
12.00 – 15.00	<p>London Walk – <i>An Ever Changing Metropolis</i> It includes visits to the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Saw Swee Hock Student Centre of the London School of Economics</i> (2014), Civic Trust Awards – Special Award for Brick Architects: Sheila O'Donnell & John Tuomey, RIBA Royal Gold Medal • <i>Millennium Bridge</i> (1996-2000), 2003 RIBA Award Architects: Foster & Partners • <i>Tate Modern</i> – Switch House (competition: 2005, execution: 2016-2016) and Boiler House (competition: 1994-5, execution: 1998-2000) Architects: Herzog & DeMeuron

PROGRAM OF SESSIONS

Thursday, 27 October 2016

Session 1 *Procedural Tactics* – Chair: Antigoni Katsakou & Maria Theodorou

1. Cilly Jansen

Recent developments in Dutch design contest culture

Discussants: Magnus Rönn
Rebecca Crabtree

2. Magnus Rönn

Developer competition in Gothenburg - A case study on architectural design, building and housing cost

Discussants: Rebecca Crabtree
Birgitte Sauge

3. Rebecca Crabtree

Finding the client within the competition brief: A study of two architectural competition briefs for the ways in which they can be read to uncover the client and their needs

Discussants: Birgitte Sauge
Cilly Jansen

4. Birgitte Sauge

“To BIM or not to BIM?”

A study of the use of BIM in architectural competitions and its impact on practice

Discussants: Cilly Jansen
Magnus Rönn

Session 2 Social Strategies – Chair: David Vanderburgh & Torsten Schmiedeknecht

1. Carmela Cucuzzella

From Experimental to Normative Environmental Architecture Design in Canadian Competitions

Discussants: Leif Östman
Daryl Martin / Sarah Nettleton / Chrissy Buse

2. Leif Östman

The Modern Vitruvian Criteria for Sustainable Houses

Discussants: Carmela Cucuzzella
Daryl Martin / Sarah Nettleton / Chrissy Buse

3. Daryl Martin / Sarah Nettleton / Chrissy Buse

Future care, architecturally induced: the role of the body in designs for later life

Discussants: Leif Östman
Carmela Cucuzzella

4. Jonas Andersson

When all is said and done, an architectural competition, was it a good idea?

Discussants: Carmela Cucuzzella
Daryl Martin / Sarah Nettleton / Chrissy Buse

Session 3 Professional Procedures – Chair: Jonas Andersson

1. Walter Menteth

E-procurement and the Public Architectural Competitions' mesh

Discussants: Michel Geertse

Linda Leitāne-Šmīdberga

2. Michel Geertse

Competition and innovation in Dutch architecture competitions

Discussants: Linda Leitāne-Šmīdberga

Walter Menteth

3. Linda Leitāne-Šmīdberga

25 years of uncertainty: architecture competitions in Latvia

Discussants: Walter Menteth

Michel Geertse

Friday, 28 October 2016

Session 4 Political Assemblages – Chair: Magnus Rönn

1. Jan Silberberger / Ignaz Strebel

The obligatory passage point

Discussants: Bechara Helal

Lina Stergiou

2. Bechara Helal

Give Me a Competition and I Will Change the World: Of Architecture Competitions as Experimental Levers of the Political Laboratory

Discussants: Lina Stergiou

Jan Silberberger

3. Lina Stergiou

competitions@avant-garde.domain

Discussants: Bechara Helal

Jan Silberberger

Session 5 Experimenting with the 'Social' – Chair: Jean-Pierre Chupin

1. Florian Kossak

Strategien für Kreuzberg – relocating urban regeneration debates into the neighbourhood

Discussants: Christakis Chatzichristou / Elias Kranos

Craig Stott / Simon Warren

2. Christakis Chatzichristou / Elias Kranos

On innovation in architecture: The case of the award winning houses in Cyprus

Discussants: Florian Kossak

Merle Patchett / Stephanie Davidson / Georg Rafailidis / Rob Shields

3. Craig Stott / Simon Warren

Experimenting with Alumni Pedagogy

Discussants: Merle Patchett / Stephanie Davidson / Georg Rafailidis / Rob Shields
Florian Kossak

4. Merle Patchett / Stephanie Davidson / Georg Rafailidis / Rob Shields

Experiments in Strip Appeal

Discussants: Florian Kossak
Christakis Chatzichristou / Elias Kranos

Session 6 *Representation and Judgment* – Chair: Elisabeth Tostrup

1. Jean-Pierre Chupin

Stamps, Butterflies and Architectural Data: Editorial Commentaries of Competitions as Re-collection and Re-cognition of Re-presentations

Discussants: Tiina Merikoski
Naghm Al-Qaysi / Poorang Piroozfar / Ryan Southal / Eric Farr

2. Tiina Merikoski

Beyond illusions – towards a commensurable evaluation of competition proposals

Discussants: Nagham Al-Qaysi / Poorang Piroozfar / Ryan Southal / Eric Farr
Jean-Pierre Chupin

3. Nagham Al-Qaysi / Poorang Piroozfar / Ryan Southal / Eric Farr

Judgment in architectural competitions as communicative deliberative practice

Discussants: Jean-Pierre Chupin
Tiina Merikoski

WELCOME

I'd like to offer a warm welcome from The Leeds School of Architecture, Leeds Beckett University and the city of Leeds to academics and students from across the world to The Sixth International Conference on Competitions.

The Leeds School of Architecture operates within the School of Art, Architecture, and Design, an ideal setting to support our ambition to sustain architecture as a critical and collaborative practice, and to lead debate about future approaches to the built environment, as a hub for emerging forms of practice, and innovative interdisciplinary research.

Our courses address in different ways the role of the contemporary architect in relation to physical and social contexts – from responses to climate change, the revitalisation of the post-industrial city, to ideas of urbanity and community, to the application of forms of digital fabrication and new technologies, and exploration of opportunities afforded by big data, and applications of new media to reinvent the languages of architecture in multidisciplinary practices.

The focus of this year's International Competitions Conference is Experimentation, and where better to undertake this than in a school with a long history of experimental and challenging based studio practice, famed for its interdisciplinary approaches. Our School's principle of learning through theory and practice is enabled by deep and meaningful links with industry, community and the professions. The Leeds Beckett School of Art, Architecture and Design, with a history that spans over 150 years, is united by a common goal: to encourage individuality, to inspire creativity, and to create impact. The school itself aims is to instil confidence, curiosity and commitment in all of our students and to give them the freedom and independence to both think, and to make.

Today The Leeds School of Architecture is housed in the award winning Broadcasting Place, an ideal environment to promote our ambition to practise architecture as a cultural and critical act in society, and in the physical environment. The International Conference on Competitions - which includes a roundtable discussion under the auspices of the RIBA and UIA competitions - seeks to examine wide ranging notions of "competition" and importantly discuss the range of approaches to architectural competitions including those that tackle social and political issues, areas very much in keeping with the School's own Architecture Project Office, a RIBA accredited live architectural practice that involves a unique collaboration of staff and students with the aim to educate in problem-solving, change-provoking professionals with a conscience.

Dr Lisa Stansbie

Dean of The Leeds School of Art, Architecture and Design

KEYNOTE TALKS

Kristian Kreiner (DK)

As the conference title indicates, architectural competitions constitute nested experiments. In my speech, I will focus on three such experiments and give empirical illustrations of each of them.

First, the design of architectural competitions is subject to experimentation. Unique forms of competition emerge, most of them probably short-lived being judged as failures or inferior to conventional forms. However, some such experiments fertilize processes of change in relation to competition practices and institutions.

Second, architectural competitions offer the participating architects repeated occasions for experimenting with competition strategies. On a crude scale, strategies can vary from professional to service-minded, the former extreme on the scale emphasizing the needs of the client, the latter extreme the wishes of the client.

Third, architectural competitions can be considered natural experiments. A number of individual architects (or firms) work in parallel on highly complex, uncertain, and ambiguous tasks. While necessarily reducing the complexity, uncertainty, and ambiguity in order to produce and justify a design proposal, they all do so in their own distinct manner. In effect, they can be seen as experimenting with reasonable ways of coping with a paradoxical situation, knowing that only the winner will be seen as coping in a legitimate way.

Framing architectural competitions in terms of experimentation suggests that learning becomes a critical concern. In general, experiments are legitimized by the lessons they teach us. For reasons to be explained, in each of the forms of experimentation described above learning is problematic. The risk of superstitious learning is immanent, and the practice of ignoring history (experience) seems widespread. We need to discuss what experimentation means under such conditions.

Kristian Kreiner is Professor Emeritus at Copenhagen Business School, Department of Organization. In his organizational studies, he has covered a long list of themes and subjects, including decision making, sense making, project management, and culture. For many years, his empirical field of research has been the building industry. He has published repeatedly on architectural competitions, having done ethnographic studies of competition design, architects' production of design proposals, and the decision processes of juries.

Aymone Nicolas (FR)

What has the role of the UIA been in the past and in the organisation of international competitions from 1948 to 1975? To which point these “modern and universal” competitions demonstrate an experimental approach in terms of procedures, commissioner and building types or even of building programs? This presentation addresses the above questions. Through several case studies of competitions organised with the help of the UIA and sometimes with the participation in the jury of its first secretary Pierre Vago: the competition for the palace of Addis-Abeba (1950), the competition for the Auschwitz or the Dachau memorial (1956 and 1957), the one for the World Health Organisation (1960), and the one for the Centre Georges Pompidou (1971), Aymone Nicolas shows how the dissemination of the competition practice in countries remote from Europe has helped to liberate architecture and to provide confidence in the different agents. The preparation phase and the sessions of the jury were at the moment the only occasions for dialogue and the development of an architectural culture within the upper circles. Finally, the history of the ideas competition launched for the conception of the Art Centre Georges Pompidou between 1969 and 1971 allows for the demonstration, after 1968, of the invention of a new discipline: the planning and development of new procedures both more discursive and rational. Three indispensable qualities allowing for the generation of methodological, social, and political experimentation are thus confirmed: trust, dialogue and a clear vision for a political project.

Aymone Nicolas was born in Mostaganem in 1973 and grew in Black Africa. From 1990 to 1995 she studied at the Ecole supérieure des Beaux-Arts and the Faculty of Letters in Montpellier. Then she went on to study history of the 20th century architecture at the University Panthéon-Sorbonne, where she completed her Doctorate degree in 2002 under the guidance of Prof. Gérard Monnier. Her PhD on UIA and architecture and urban design competitions between 1948 and 1975 was published by Editions Picard in 2007. She then taught at the School of Architecture of Paris-Malaquais and worked as a scholar at the German Centre of Art History in Paris (DFGK) from 2000 to 2006. Having spent several years in Berlin, during her studies, she organised various study trips for French architects in the German capital, and also in Vorarlberg and Hambourg. Since 2007, she lives in the south of France and works as a tutor in the field of ecological construction, at the cooperative society Ecoterre.

Jeremy Till (UK)

COMPETITIVE STRAIN SYNDROME

Behind the superficial gloss of architectural competitions lies a much dirtier reality. The competition system, in its multiple guises and glosses, disguises a malaise which is indicative of a much broader set of issues that should concern the architectural profession. This lecture will approach architectural competitions through the frame of labour, arguing that we have reached levels of exploitation and waste that are both unethical and economically unsustainable.

Looking inwards I will first relate architectural competitions to the manipulative rituals of architectural education, and then looking outwards to the emerging precariat. The former perpetuates a set of conservative values under a thin veneer of progress. The latter situates architectural labour within the inequities of the neo-liberal market. In both cases the architectural competition appears to magnify conditions that the architectural profession faces but is not engaging with. The story is not a comfortable one because it argues that the human cost of architectural competitions is in no way justified by the marginal cultural gains. Indeed, I take issue with the assumption that competitions in some way produce ‘better’ buildings. The only bright point might be to watch me struggle to make the connection between Pugin and online logo-mills.

Jeremy Till is an architect, educator and writer. He is Head of Central Saint Martins and Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research at the University of the Arts London. Till's extensive written work includes the books *Flexible Housing*, *Architecture Depends* and *Spatial Agency*, all three of which won the prestigious RIBA President's Award for Research. As an architect, he worked with Sarah Wigglesworth Architects on their pioneering building, 9 Stock Orchard Street, winner of many awards including the RIBA Sustainability Prize. He curated the UK Pavilion at the 2006 Venice Architecture Biennale and also at the 2013 Shenzhen Biennale of Architecture and Urbanism.

Eva Franch i Gilabert (USA)

Throughout history, competitions have constructed a relationship of servitude between architects and the structures of economic, political and cultural power.

While the concept of the competition brief serves as the initial document for the manifestation of desires, either through programmatic, economic or formal needs, the role of the architect is often reduced to answering questions that someone else has asked. In exceptional occasions however, the architect's ability to reinvent and produce new desires occurs in the form of a rebellion against the brief, in which the architect is driven by the pure belief that real needs are contained outside of given principles.

Given that competitions operate in a confined space for experimentation, they have perpetuated and sometimes repeated ad nauseam, a series of programmatic and social needs – from Museums to Concert Halls – without actually asking what the needs are of society, that architecture should aspire to serve.

This lecture will reflect upon the fact that the true desires of our present society are outside of the current taxonomy of competition briefs, and that architects should be participants in the construction of the questions they are asked to answer.

If a competition is the articulation of society's desires in space, what new desires should we consider? What are the questions of our time that we should be asking architects, urban planners and policy makers to redefine the way in which we build our cities and territories? What underrepresented spaces, individuals or collectives need to be explored? And, what are the agents, authorities or organizations from which the competitions should be promoted?

Eva Franch is a New York based architect, curator, educator and lecturer of experimental forms of art and architectural practice. In 2004, she founded her solo practice OOAA (Office of Architectural Affairs) and since 2010 is the Chief Curator and Executive Director of Storefront for Art and Architecture in New York. In 2014 Franch, with the project OfficeUS, was selected by the US State Department to represent the United States Pavilion at the XIV Venice Architecture Biennale. Franch has taught at Columbia University GSAPP, the IUAV University of Venice, SUNY Buffalo, and Rice University School of Architecture.

RIBA-UIA ROUNDTABLE

Discussion Themes

Theme 1

Professional experience from competitions and impact on architects' career in the UK, and the UIA international competitions

(Experimenting WITHIN competitions)

Theme 2:

Competition projects as catalysts for reinventing a city area?

(Experimenting WITH competitions)

Roundtable Speakers

Jerzy Grochulski

Co-director UIA International Competitions' Commission

Cindy Walters RIBA

Walters & Cohen architects

Roger Hawkins RIBA

Hawkins Brown architects

Bill Taylor RIBA

Robin Snell & Partners

Chair

Andrew Wilson

Head of Leeds School of Architecture, Leeds Beckett University

Ph.D. Jerzy Jacek Grochulski, born in September 23, 1956, Ostrowiec Świętokrzyski, Poland.

Vicepresident of Association of Polish Architects (2015-2019), Former President of SARP (2006-2012), UIA II Region Council Member since 2011, Co-director of UIA International Competitions Commission since 2014.

Assistant Professor Warsaw University of Technology Department of Architecture since 1989, Vice-Dean at Warsaw University of Technology since 2016.

Since 1990 an owner, designer and partner in „PRO-ARTE 11” Ltd Warsaw, an architecture atelier, specialized in sport facilities, school design and housing.

Member of Chamber of Polish Architects.

Member of Author's Law Commission Ministry of Culture (1997 -2004), City Architecture and Urban Commission in Warsaw (2000 – 2003) and Governmental Commission of Spatial Planning and Architecture at the Ministry of Infrastructure (2014 – 2016).

Cindy Walters, B Arch, RIBA, is co-founder of Walters & Cohen Architects. She was born in Australia, studied architecture in South Africa and moved to London in 1990 to work for Foster + Partners before setting up the practice with Michál Cohen in 1994.

Her passion for design has led to a diverse range of education, leisure, cultural and commercial projects in the public and private sectors, many of which have won prestigious awards and received praise from the people who use them. These include Bedales School in Hampshire, the Shirley Sherwood Gallery of Botanical Art at Kew Gardens, Regent High School in London and the Vajrasana Buddhist Retreat Centre in Suffolk. Current projects include a major new multi-purpose building at Newnham College, Cambridge.

Outside the practice, Cindy regularly contributes to academic and professional institutions as an external examiner and guest lecturer. Her long-standing involvement with the RIBA Awards Group included roles as a member of the Lubetkin Prize jury, Stirling Prize jury, and judge for the President's Research Awards. She is one of Design Council Cabe's Built Environment Experts and a trustee for the Young Women's Trust. Cindy is also undertaking a PhD at the Bartlett; her central research question relates to the contemporary relevance of the pavilion as an archetypal architectural form and how this can mediate between ideal notions of design and the exigencies of practice.

Roger Hawkins founded Hawkins\Brown with Russell Brown in 1988. Prior to this he worked for VVKR in the USA and at Rock Townsend.

His involvement with the RIBA includes being Chairman of the RIBA Insurance Agency and member of the RIBA Validation Board. He has been active in supporting RIBA Competitions including the Advisor to the ODA for the Olympic Velodrome. Roger lectures at architectural schools, conferences and writes for the architectural press and is a leading reviewer and critic at Sheffield University and at Yale University in the USA.

Roger is a people person. His ability to see things from the client's viewpoint and to get into the mindset of users is key to the way Hawkins\Brown practice architecture. He is a great strategist with a keen attention to detail. He sees the opportunity in everything and uses this to raise the aspirations of those around him.

William Taylor, DipArch., MA RIBA FRSA. A graduate of the University of Sheffield, I joined Michael Hopkins in 1982 and was awarded the RIBA Presidents Medal for Architectural Design that year. Upon completion of the Mound Stand at Lord's Cricket Ground, I became Michael and Patty's partner in 1988 and my subsequent projects included the Inland Revenue, Nottingham, Jubilee Campus and subsequent projects for the University of Nottingham, Manchester Art Gallery, National Tennis Centre for the LTA at Roehampton. In 2010 I left the practice and my role of Managing Director to concentrate on my own projects and interests, which included a site that I had recently acquired.

Since 2011, I have been in practice with my partner and long-time collaborator Robin Snell and our varied work includes projects on the Wormsley Estate for Garsington Opera, the Island Pavilion and restoration of a listed barn for the owner, projects at London Coliseum for English National Opera, and most recently we are part of a team selected through competition to design a new pedestrian and cycle bridge over the Thames linking Nine Elms Battersea with Pimlico.

I was a Member of the CABE Olympic Design Review Panel, the RIBA Sustainable Futures Committee and was a founding member of the pan European Tensinet Group, researching and developing the fields of lightweight and membrane architecture. I have also taught, examined and lectured widely at schools of architecture in the UK, Europe, North America and Japan and my work has been published in the UK and overseas.

I have participated in and judged a large number of architectural competitions throughout my life in practice. I have been an Architect Adviser for the RIBA Competitions Scheme for many years and the projects and practices I have promoted in this way include a number of Stirling Shortlisted buildings. Most recently I was the architect

adviser for the Pylons for the Future Competition for DFEE and National Grid and for the new Paul Marshall Building at the London School of Economics.

Andrew Wilson is Head of The Leeds School of Architecture. He established NMBW in Melbourne with Marika Neustupny, Lucinda McLean, and Nigel Bertram in 1993, and is Principal of NMBW Queensland Office. He has worked in practice on built and speculative work across a range of urban and architectural projects, complex and small. He has practised in Australia and Germany, and taught and collaborated on research projects in Australia, Japan, and Belgium.

“THE COMPETITION” FILM SCREENING

'The Competition' film screening

followed by Q&A with the film director, Angel Borrego Cubero

“The Competition” is a film documenting the tense developments that characterize architectural contests. A documentary movie constructed as an almost uncomfortable but intensely fascinating account of how some of the best architects in the world, design giants like Jean Nouvel or Frank Gehry, toil, struggle and strategize to beat the competition. While nearly as old as the profession itself, architectural competitions became a social, political and cultural phenomenon of the post-Guggenheim Bilbao museums and real estate bubbles of the recent past. Taking place at the dramatic moment in which the bubble became a crisis, this is the first competition to be documented in excruciatingly raw detail.
<http://www.thecompetitionmovie.com/film/>

Angel Borrego Cubero (Llerena, Spain, 1967) is trained in architecture, with a PhD from ETSA Madrid and a MArch from Princeton University, where he was a Fulbright scholar. He has been teaching architecture and working as an architect since the '90s while also developing an interdisciplinary body of works that deal with issues such as the contemporary urban condition, the negotiations between private and public space, violence, surveillance and fictions in architecture. Using mainly site specific installations, new media and video installations, his work has been exhibited in internationally acclaimed venues such as the Art Fair ARCO, the National Museum of Art Reina Sofia, LABoral, Artium, El Matadero Madrid etc.

Paper sessions

Thursday, 27 October 2016

Session 1: Procedural tactics

Chair: Antigoni Katsakou & Maria Theodorou

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN DUTCH DESIGN CONTEST CULTURE

Cilly Jansen

Architectuur Lokaal NL

In recent years the number of design contests in the Netherlands continued to increase. This has occurred within a period of great change in the context of how architecture is realised as well as a shift to the question of how social challenges can be translated into physical terms. The client role is no longer reserved for public parties; numerous other 'players' are now taking the lead. Design contests are an interesting instrument in this changing environment and more suitable to find innovative solutions than tenders for architecture. Architectuur Lokaal developed new, simplified procedures for contests which are widely supported. One of them appears to be the favourite: the 'Open Call based on a Vision'. This is a public or non-public design contest in two rounds. There is no pre-selection. The first round takes the character of an 'ideas' contest with the participants submitting a concise (written and illustrated) vision of the project. No design is submitted as strict submission requirements are stipulated to avoid large volumes of work. An independent jury selects a limited number of submissions; the designers of these are invited to elaborate their vision further, for a fee, in a second round. The first results, by young architects who usually cannot enter tenders through lack of a suitable portfolio, are under construction. Interest in this procedure is also coming from other countries.

DEVELOPER COMPETITION IN GOTHENBURG: A CASE STUDY ON ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN, BUILDING AND HOUSING COST

Magnus Rönn, Associate Professor

Department of Architecture, School of Architecture and the Built Environment,
Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, SE

This paper examines a single developer competition in Gothenburg, 2013. This type of competition emerged as a professional practice with the deregulation in the 1980s. Developer

competitions have been expanding and are nowadays much more common than traditional architectural competitions in Sweden.

The global objective is to contribute to knowledge about using developer competitions as a tool for designing, building and implementing a winning design. The political objective of the competition in Gothenburg is to create good housing with reasonable rent. Ten design teams delivered entries that fulfilled the requirement for maximum level of rent. The implementation of the winning entry became problematic. For this reason the following two research issues stand out as being important to investigate: 1) Planning, organizing and judging from the client's perspective. 2) Team building, competition task, design proposals and judgments seen from the design team's point of view? Both perspectives are crucial to the competition as a professional laboratory and a new tool for political ambitions.

Case Study Methodology is a comprehensive research strategy in this investigation of a single developer competition. Methods for the collection and analysis of data are:

- *Archive Studies; Competition documents have been collected from local archives.*
- *Document analysis: Relevant documents have been studied through close reading.*
- *Interviews: Three key players (organizer, architects and developers) and 65 informants have been identified. Of these, 56 responded to a questionnaire with open questions.*

From the collected data we get a good understanding of the competition as a whole. The findings can be summarized by eight conclusions: 1) Developer competition as a competition form; (2) Competition as a tool for political ambitions, (3) Information sharing, (4) Team building, (5) Demands in the brief as obstacles and inspiration, (6) Innovation, (7) Motives for competing and (8) Key players' perspectives and experiences.

Keywords: developer competition, design team, housing design, rent

FINDING THE CLIENT WITHIN THE COMPETITION BRIEF: A STUDY OF TWO ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION BRIEFS FOR THE WAYS IN WHICH THEY CAN BE READ TO UNCOVER THE CLIENT AND THEIR NEEDS.

Rebecca Crabtree, BArch, Dip. AA, ARB
Architect and Principal at P/ARC (people-architecture), UK

The successful delivery of a built project depends on the success of the architect-client relationship during all stages of that project. The architecture competition ignores the need for a client with which the architect can interact during the early stages of a project, and consequently removes the opportunity to develop an understanding of the client's needs through conversation and exchange. Instead, the competition brief is the architect's primary resource from which to produce their proposal and is made the acting client.

Architecture competitions are commissioned by various client types and are delivered through varying structures. Recent history has seen the emergence of the role of the professional brief

writer (the competition management consultant), who is employed by the client to deliver the competition. How might this role effect the architect's ability to 'read' the client in the brief?

How can a text be made to stand in for the conversation that occurs between the architect and the client at the beginning of a project? How might a brief be read to avoid it becoming one-sided?

This paper explores the composition, word and image choices forming a competition brief, in order to establish how the client can be recognised in the text.

Keywords: client-designer relationship, briefing process, brief writing, communication, identity

"TO BIM OR NOT TO BIM?"

A STUDY OF THE USE OF BIM IN ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITIONS AND ITS IMPACT ON PRACTICE

Birgitte Sauge, Dr. Art.

Senior curator at The National Museum of Art, Architecture and Design, NO

Building Information Model (BIM) is in this paper understood as a digital 3D model of a proposed building made by the architecture firm for sharing information in order to create efficient cooperation between different skills engaged in the building process and in the maintenance of the building. The focus of the paper is the use of BIM in architecture competitions, a highly relevant aspect of digitization of the architecture sector and the competition practice in particular. The object of study is the recent open concept and design competition for the Viking Age Museum in Oslo, held by the Directorate for Public Building (Statsbygg). Using different analytical approaches and various analyses of the members of the secretariat, the jury, the 116 competing teams, their entries and the evaluations and the debate, the aim is to gain new insight into how BIM are bound up in contemporary competition practice and related architectural processes, thereby reconfiguring the practices. The study is part of a research project in progress and the paper thus neither confirms nor rejects the hypothesis that there is a distinct connection between the inclusion of BIM and the evaluation of the entries, but rather intends to open up the discussion from a research point of view.

Keywords: BIM, competition practice, digitization, media, Viking Age Museum

Session 2: Social Strategies

Chair: David Vanderburgh & Torsten Schmiedeknecht

FROM EXPERIMENTAL TO NORMATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL ARCHITECTURE DESIGN IN CANADIAN COMPETITIONS

Carmela Cucuzzella, PhD, Associate Professor

Design and Computation Arts, Concordia University, Montreal, CA

University Research Chair in Integrated Design and Sustainability for the Built

Environment (ideas-be.ca)

LEAP lab (leap.architecture.org)

Anghelos Coulon, MA, Research Assistant

University Research Chair in Integrated Design and Sustainability for the Built

Environment (ideas-be.ca) + LEAP lab (leap.architecture.org), CA

How is environmental design influencing the way in which cultural public places (museums, libraries, parks, campuses) are imagined, designed and symbolized in Canadian competitions? In the 1960s, the drive towards holistic approaches of public and individual human settlements gave rise to the idea of environmental design, as a means to transcend the boundaries between various design disciplines: architecture, landscape, urban and product design (Sanoff and Cohn, 1975). In the 1970s, environmentalism started to shift towards an ecological ideology soon dominated by technical solutions (Naess, 1973, Jonas, 1985). This technological turn was driven by highly structured principles in the search for efficiency (Tischner et al., 2000, Fletcher and Goggin, 2001, Birkeland, 2002).

My research hypothesis states that shifting values and significances in the environmental discourse for cultural public places are not mere rhetorical choices, but meaningful traces of deeper transformations induced by environmentalism. We will compare a series of architecture competitions launched between the 1970s and the 2000s in order to better understand the ever-changing movement of environmentalism. These competitions will be selected from those already archived in the database, Catalogue of Canadian Competitions (ccc.umontreal.ca). We are specifically seeking to map out the design approaches within the spectrum of experimental design on the one end and normative design on the other.

Keywords: architecture competitions, environmental design, normative environmentalism, experimental environmentalism, environmental discourse

THE MODERN VITRUVIAN CRITERIA FOR SUSTAINABLE HOUSES

Leif Östman, Principal lecturer, architect SAFA
Novia, University of Applied Sciences, FI

The basic historical criteria for judging architecture has been the Vitruvian three principles: solid, useful and beautiful. Since the seventies the discussions have been going on about the limits of growth, and sustainability requirements have been integrated into legislation and business policies. In analogy with the unity of the Vitruvian qualities sustainability is often expressed as a balanced consideration of ecology, economy and social aspects. Professionals within urban planning and architecture have provided different answers to this, depending on the design brief and the context. The demand for sustainable solutions are also frequent in competition briefs. The question is: How can we integrate sustainability issues into municipal developer competitions? Architecture is in most cases judged holistically. The assessment of both quantities and qualities seem problematic. The other problematic aspect is that architectural qualities are best expressed visually, whereas sustainability is not so easy to visualize but rather needs written explanations. This paper is a concept clarification aiming at clarifying how to manage such a complex assessment in a developer competition with special focus on energy efficiency and innovation.

Keywords: municipal developer competition, sustainability, energy efficiency, Vitruvius

FUTURE CARE, ARCHITECTURALLY INDUCED: THE ROLE OF THE BODY IN DESIGNS FOR LATER LIFE

Sarah Nettleton¹, Christina Buse² and Daryl Martin³

¹ Professor, Department of Sociology, University of York, UK

² PhD, Research Fellow, Department of Sociology, University of York, UK

³ PhD, Lecturer, Department of Sociology, University of York, UK

Architects invariably anticipate future dwellings and shape built environments in ways that are critical for ageing bodies. In their designs architects articulate socio-political visions and reproduce normative cultural scripts of care, embodiment and well-being in later life. This paper seeks to extend our previous work on how architects design health and social care environments by exploring how assumptions and articulations of ageing bodies are made manifest in architectural plans. We turn our attention to architectural drawings submitted for an international student design competition in 2009 entitled: Caring for Older People. The objective of the competition was to encourage architectural students to envisage the challenges that caring for later life may entail, and to imagine how best to design care homes for the future. From our analysis of the 69 design entries, written comments of the expert judging panel and the competition brief, we illustrate the variety of ways in which aged bodies were conceived by these future professionals. Bodies sometimes have an absent or implied presence in the drawings, but in all the architectural plans we can discern ideas about how spaces will be experienced, along with expectations and assumptions about ageing bodies. We analyse the visual and discursive strategies by which aged bodies were, inter alia,

represented as frail, healthy, technologically engaged and socially situated in wider family, community and urban settings. These representations offer insight into the ways in which architects inscribed a variety of ideas about care and embodiment in the proposed care settings. We end by reflecting on how ideologies of care can be reproduced through architectural spaces, and argue that a dialogue between architecture and sociology has the potential to transform concepts of ageing, embodiment and care.

Keywords: architecture, design, images of ageing, embodiment

WHEN ALL IS SAID AND DONE, AN ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION, WAS IT A GOOD IDEA?

Jonas E Andersson

Architect SAR/ MSA and PhD fellow at the School of Architecture, Royal Institute of Technology, KTH, and expert advisor at the Swedish Agency for Participation (Myndigheten för delaktighet, MFD), both institutions in Stockholm, SE

In 2004, development plans for the Swedish municipality of Järfälla detected a severe disappointment concerning appropriate forms of housing for frail older citizens. In 2006, the municipality organized an architectural competition in order to renew housing for dependent and frail older persons. In 2007, a winner was selected from 33 submitted proposals. The proposal was made by Danish architects, who envisioned different types of housing that were organized around a central residential care home that became the centre for the town plan.

The paper is a study on how architectonic visions were converted into a built environment under the influence of Swedish civil administration. Interviews with 10 key informants, involved in different stages of the process, along with official documentation allowed for reconstructing stages that influenced the course of the project. The research was focused on the perceived similarity between the winning proposal and the actual realization.

The analysis of the research material identified three decisive stages in the realization of the winning proposal. Firstly, the commission, which the architects had won, created problems since it could be seen as merely a town plan or a plan in combination with a building commission. Secondly, public regulations on tendering procedures generated spatial problems for the key building of the town plan as well as for segments of the full plan. Thirdly, the financial market in a large city region affected the level of architectural quality. The study identified a continuum of exterior influence that could be termed as adaptiveness that organisational and political priorities imposed on the competition proposal.

Keywords: architectural competition, winning proposal, realization process, imposed adaptiveness

Session 3: Professional Procedures

Chair: Jonas Andersson

E-PROCUREMENT AND THE PUBLIC ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITIONS MESH

Walter Menteth

Director Walter Menteth Architects and Project Compass CIC, UK

The practical and political perspectives that inform the systemic processes, procedures and outputs of architectural competitions are the focus of this paper. The recent context of European architectural competitions policy, UK and European critiques levelled against it, along with the evidential basis for this are summarily reviewed. The research methodology that has been developed to inform forward policy reform and UK proposals submitted towards the reform process are described. Central to this position is the clearly identified need to significantly improve and enable opportunity for better and more accessible architectural competitions in Europe and the UK.

On the basis of the evidential findings, four innovative e-procurement initiatives are described, in the framework of the newly reformed Public Contracts Directive 2014/24/EU, the ongoing programme of Project Compass CIC, a UK architectural competitions intelligence service, and thefulcrum.eu, a nascent pan European collaborative network.

These include: ‘The Fulcrum’ network, what it delivers, and the partnership opportunities for those wishing to engage; the ‘Compass’ services for automated competitive procedures extending from pre competitive stage to management of live competitions; the ‘ESPD, the European Single Procurement Document’ or so-called Procurement passport; and the UK’s IT public procurement cloud framework model, known as ‘the G Cloud or the digital market place’.

Opening the market by being more transparent, accessible and efficient brings benefits for all and significantly improves access and opportunities for architects who are SME’s and micro businesses. For processes and procedures these tools offer simplicity which can deliver efficiency through automation. By removing the appearance of undue procedural complexity and moving to digital ‘Amazon’ style services, these help unlock the competition’s mess.

COMPETITION AND INNOVATION IN DUTCH ARCHITECTURE COMPETITIONS

Michel Geertse, dr. mr.

Royal Institute of Danish Architects (BNA), DN

Demand is a major potential source of innovation. Therefore the European Union and the Dutch government have issued public procurement policies to stimulate innovation and to improve the accessibility of public contracts to SMEs as drivers of employment, economic

growth and innovation. However, these objectives are often lost in everyday architecture competition practice in the Netherlands. These procedures profess an ambiguous relation between competition and innovation. There is no perfect competition. Formidable market entry barriers shut out young and starting architects, as well as local and small businesses. The procurement regime often obstructs innovation. It stimulates commodification of design through ‘objective and transparent criteria’ and thus induces rule-based (predictable and safe) design. Moreover, as a rule Dutch architecture competitions offer inadequate returns (financially and otherwise) on investments in design innovation. This paper examines the problematic relation between competition and innovation in Dutch architecture competitions in the period 2013–2015.

Keywords: Competition, innovation, rule-based design, market entry barriers, return on investment

25 YEARS OF UNCERTAINTY: ARCHITECTURE COMPETITIONS IN LATVIA

Linda Leitāne-Šmīdberga,

M. Arch., PhD student Riga Technical University, LV

25 years since regaining independence in 1991 Latvia is marked by unprecedented socio-economic processes that have distinctively reshaped thinking and practice in architecture requiring adaptation to the demands of free market. In the course of this period more than 500 architectural competitions constitute half of the total number of architectural competitions in Latvia since the mid-19th century. Identifying five consecutive phases of accelerated architecture competition practice over the last 25 years, the paper examines procedures, outcomes and reasons behind success and failures. The specifics of the phase I Confusion (1991–1996) is explained through substitution state commissions with the first private interests and funding. Information exchange initiated taking over the latest trends of international experience delineates features of the phase II Acceleration (1997–2002). This is followed by the phase III of Controlled Utopia (2003–2008) when building process reached its momentum. The phase IV Lower Level (2008–2011) is initiated by the global economic crisis, eventually leading to the phase V of Integration of Knowledge (2012–2016). Providing multiple narratives on each of the phases, the paper critically reflects on the current potential of the architectural competition practice, arguing that the building processes have consequently provoked not only a spontaneous and hectic architectural and urban environment, but also allowed for an accumulation of knowledge to challenge good practice guidelines and rigid legal frameworks. The paper concludes with comments on the omnipresent uncertainty whether the competition practice still has its ability to be an instrument to evaluate potentials of the building sites and to be turned into a design tool to acquire the best architectural solutions.

Keywords: architecture competitions, organizational process, competition regulations, competition culture in Latvia

Friday, 28 October 2016

Session 4: Political Assemblages

Chair: Magnus Rönn

THE OBLIGATORY PASSAGE POINT

Jan Silberberger¹ and Ignaz Strebel²

¹ Ph.D., ETH Wohnforum – ETH CASE, ETH Zurich, CH

² Ph.D., ETH Wohnforum – ETH CASE, ETH Zurich, CH

While research on architectural competitions can be considered a well-established field nowadays, research on the transition between the competition procedure and the subsequent project phase remains fragmentary. The paper at hand aims at addressing this gap. Standing in the tradition of actor-network theory (Callon 1986; Law and Hassard 1999; Latour 2005) the paper is attentive to the various displacements that shape a construction project from strategic planning and preliminary studies to the end of the competition procedure and then through the subsequent project phase. In particular, the paper develops a perspective on architectural competitions and their outcomes as (temporary) equilibriums basing on the translation of various – oftentimes highly heterogeneous – entities. As the paper shows, this state of equilibrium can be subject to major contestations and therefore is to be considered as a rather fragile alliance. Against this background it is argued that executing an architectural competition and integrating it into the building process is essentially about finding a balance between determining the involved entities' identities as precisely as possible and at the same time providing an adequate scope for their renegotiation.

Keywords: architectural competition; building process; project phase, actor-network theory; moments of translation

GIVE ME A COMPETITION AND I WILL CHANGE THE WORLD OF ARCHITECTURE COMPETITIONS AS EXPERIMENTAL LEVERS OF THE POLITICAL LABORATORY

Bechara Helal, Ph.D. candidate

Research Chair on Competitions and Contemporary Practices in Architecture

LEAP (Laboratoire d'Étude de l'Architecture Potentielle)

École d'Architecture, Faculté de l'Aménagement, Université de Montréal, CA

*Architectural and scientific laboratories can be seen as analogous. In that sense, they differ on certain aspect while sharing similarities. One of these similarities is a specific relation to the broader world. As science historian Peter Galison (1999) stated, while the figure of the laboratory is ever shifting throughout history, at its core is a dual relation to the world: it is at once an understanding of the world it is set in (the “laboratory-as-mirror”) and a projection of a world it aims for (the “laboratory-as-blueprint”). In short, at the heart of the laboratory is the production of knowledge as a *raison d'être* coupled with a desire to transform the broader world: the laboratory is at once an epistemic and a political space.*

We have previously discussed how architecture competitions can, as experimental processes, be seen as epistemic spaces for the production of disciplinary knowledge (Helal, 2015). The paper we now propose tackles the political aspect of laboratories. How can the architecture laboratory act on and transform the broader world? Can experimental practices aimed towards producing specialized knowledge become political tools that enable the transgression of traditional disciplinary limits?

Building on the model developed by philosopher of science Bruno Latour (1983) highlighting the transfers of power between the scientific laboratory and the world, the argument will be made that architecture competitions can be used as political levers enabling work within the laboratory to expand beyond its walls in order to transform the world. This will be done through the study of two major national idea competitions organized and carried out in 2006 and 2007 by Anne Cormier for the Laboratoire d’Étude de l’Architecture Potentielle (LEAP, Montreal, Canada) which called for a critical rethinking and an innovative redesigning of social housing in the context of large Canadian urban settings.

References

- GALISON, P., AJIBOYÉ BAMGBOYÉ, O., ENWEZOR, O., MATTHYS, K. & VANDERLINDEN, B. 1999. Peter Galison interviewed by Oladéle Ajiboyé Bamgboyé, Okwui Enwezor, Kobe Matthys and Barbara Vanderlinden. In: OBRIST, H. U. & VANDERLINDEN, B. (eds.) *Laboratorium*. Antwerp: Dumont; Antwerpen Open; Roomade.
- HELAL, B. 2015. Competitions as Laboratories: On the So-Called 'Experimental' Nature of Architecture Competitions. In: CHUPIN, J.-P., CUCUZZELLA, C. & HELAL, B. (eds.) *Architecture Competitions and the Production of Culture, Quality and Knowledge: An International Inquiry*. Montreal: Potential Architecture Books.
- LATOUR, B. 1983. Give me a Laboratory and I Will Raise the World. In: KNORR CETINA, K. & MULKAY, M. (eds.) *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*. London: Sage.

COMPETITIONS@AVANT-GARDE.DOMAIN

Lina Stergiou, Associate Professor
Department of Architecture, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, CN

The architectural avant-garde is as I argue,¹ an operation of the profession, a driver of difference and change in architecture. It is performed by elements of the internal domain by

¹ The concept of the avant-garde as a product of architectural discourse and as an argument for its utility and function in the architectural theory and history - yet a sociologically grounded one and shaped by material conditions - is elaborated in Stergiou, L. (forthcoming) *The Concept of the Avant-Garde in Twentieth and Twenty-First Century Architecture*.

which diverse material and immaterial expressions of architecture are introduced to the discipline so to renew the profession toward the desired and necessary, for the elements that direct the process, direction. The avant-garde is political by nature, aiming at, or alleging a moment of change.

Thus this paper will elaborate the political dimension of the competition within the framework of the avant-garde and its above conception. It will assert that the nature of the competition is, from a contemporary political standpoint, a useful avant-garde tool as well as manifestation. Since few competitions are related to the avant-garde - neither do all allege change, nor all those that claim it actually lead to it - the paper will delve into those critical aspects of the competition that enable the setting out of the avant-garde operation. While asserting that the most frequently accomplished way of reaching change is, and has been, the suggestion of types of interaction between the internal and external domain of architecture, the paper will also elaborate how this affects competition's agents, organizational structures, and briefs.

Session 5: Experimenting with the 'Social'

Chair: Jean-Pierre Chupin

STRATEGIEN FÜR KREUZBERG – RELOCATING URBAN REGENERATION DEBATES INTO THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

Florian Kossak, Ph.D., Senior Lecturer
Sheffield School of Architecture, TUOS, UK

Berlin-Kreuzberg, 1977: initiated by a coalition of a local politician/architect, the pastor of the St. Thomas parish, and a loose grouping of local residents in one of West-Berlin's most deprived inner-city areas, the Berlin Senate organizes a completely new format of an open competition in order to 'let residents, not "experts", decide on the best ideas to regenerate their neighbourhood'. The competition is called "Strategien für Kreuzberg" (Strategies for Kreuzberg). It is a competition in two stages, and open to teams of architects and built environment professionals, as well as to lay people interested in the improvement of this at that time extremely vulnerable area of Berlin. With the support of public exhibitions and discussion forums a 40-member strong lay juries, made up to a large part of tenants and community group representatives, negotiated over 100 proposals to improve housing and its supporting infrastructure in Kreuzberg.

Strategien für Kreuzberg thus moved beyond the criticism of top-down planning practices as voiced since the late 1960s in Berlin (for instance through the "Diagnose zum Bauen in West-Berlin" in 1968) and brought into action central demands that were being made regarding participation in planning processes of all people concerned with their immediate built environment. It can be argued that the competition Strategien für Kreuzberg has been instrumental in "relocating" the debate of urban planning and regeneration from the confined institutional and political spaces of universities, architectural practices, planning departments and local councils into a whole urban neighbourhood, to include a wider affected community in participating in the transformation processes of their urban environment.

This paper shall discuss:

- *the relevance of this historical competition in the shift that happened in West-Berlin's regeneration policies and approaches as well as the formation of a Kreuzberg-specific engaged public*
- *the specific operational mechanism of this competition and here in particular the formats of public mediation and engagement, including discussion forums, travelling exhibitions, project offices etc as well as the complex set of local, professional, political and other stakeholders in the process*
- *the professional and public perception of the Strategien through various media formats*
- *the direct and indirect results of the Strategien, including concrete transformations of the public realm, new infrastructure or building improvements, but also the consequential*

towards the Careful Urban Regeneration approach in Berlin and the International Building Exhibition (IBA) 1984/1987 on the one hand and the 1980/81 squatting movement on the other.

The paper will argue that such a radically emancipatory approach to public competitions can still present an invaluable potential for a competition and urban regeneration praxis today.

ON INNOVATION IN ARCHITECTURE: THE CASE OF THE AWARD WINNING HOUSES IN CYPRUS

Christakis Chatzichristou¹, Elias Kranos²

¹ Associate Professor, Department of Architecture, University of Cyprus, CY

² PhD Candidate, Department of Architecture, University of Cyprus, CY

The paper examines a sample of fourteen Greek-Cypriot houses distinguished through two award schemes and raises a number of questions regarding innovation in architectural design: To what degree should a move in design be made consciously in order to be considered as innovative? Can a design be evaluated as innovative irrespective of the outcome? What is considered as the outcome of an architectural project? Should post-occupancy evaluation be used in judging a built project such as a house which has been designed for specific clients? The analysis suggests that innovation in architectural design is more of an emergent relational quality rather than an absolute quantifiable characteristic of a project.

Keywords: award winning houses; innovation in architectural design; Cyprus

EXPERIMENTING WITH ALUMNI PEDAGOGY

Craig Stott & Simon Warren

Senior Architecture Lecturers & Project Office Co-Directors at The Leeds School of Architecture, Leeds Beckett University, UK

Project Office, Leeds Beckett University's in-house staff and student led architectural practice launched an alumni ideas competition for the Sustainable Technologies and Landscape Research Centre (STaLRC). The winning entry established the design and the winning team were engaged in a design consultancy role for further development of the work.

This case study describes an exploration of the architectural competition format through experimenting with alumni pedagogy.

The institution's association with its students is almost severed once they become alumni. By extending pedagogy, through a competition, new possibilities have arisen between this School

of Architecture and its recent former students, and for the wider context of academia and practice.

The case study explains a procedural exploration through the STaLRC competition, starting with defining the competition through a Design Guide ‘brief’ produced by second year undergraduate students of architecture. The role of Project Office as the educational and practice choreographer sets the distinctive anchoring of the project. The competition process, managed by the writers, deals with the duality of providing a ‘winning’ design that meets client’s complex requirements e.g. affordability, and the setting of an equally important educational purpose.

This paper considers how an architectural competition, used as a pedagogic tool, is harnessed in a post formal educational setting. An output for example is that alumni competitions can be legitimately situated in the (Continuing Professional Development) CPD framework, viably enabling UK schools of architecture to participate, fulfilling a professional developmental remit.

In conclusion, as the STaLRC competition is framed in an educational setting, the learning outcomes of participants are of equal importance to the quality of entries. This methodology ensures continued pedagogical value in the transition between education and profession. Recent alumni are vital and unencumbered, fledgling professionals and through the setting of this competition have been provided with their space to fledge.

EXPERIMENTS IN STRIP APPEAL

Merle Patchett¹, Stephanie Davidson², Georg Rafailidis³ and Rob Shields⁴

¹ PhD, Lecturer, University of Bristol, UK

² State University of New York at Buffalo, USA

³ State University of New York at Buffalo, USA

⁴ Professor, University of Alberta, CA

Strip Appeal (www.strip-appeal.com) was an ideas design competition intended to stimulate and showcase creative design proposals for the adaptive reuse of small-scale strip-malls. It was also a mode of experimentation both for the organizers, Patchett and Shields, and entrants and eventual winners, Davidson and Rafailidis. For the organizers, Strip Appeal offered the opportunity of experimenting with the competition as social research – a method for the generation rather than the mere collection/representation of knowledge, experience and materials relating to a much-maligned building type. For the entrants/winners it offered the opportunity of experimenting within the competition as practice - using a competition “brief” or question as a jumping-off point to explore, develop and test an architectural idea – in this case, the idea of architectural spolia – in a specific design proposal.

Following Bruno Latour (1999) the experiment can be understood as a transformative process – for the people as well as the materials involved. By staging a dialogue between organizers and entrants/winners in this paper we seek to question whether Strip Appeal was

transformative in the ways - procedural, social, representational, political - intended? Moreover, in offering the perspectives of both organizers and entrants we aim to make visible some of the opacities involved in practice – such as flows of organization/funding, mystifications of expertise and decision-making, barriers to engagement/implementation, and so forth – and thus stay alert to the dilemmas and limitations of experimentation both with and within the ideas design competition.

Keywords: Strip Mall, Matter of Concern, Design, Bruno Latour, Experiment, Competition

Session 6: Representation and Judgment

Chair: Elisabeth Tostrup

MAPPING ARCHITECTURAL WRITING ON COMPETITIONS IN THE CANADIAN COMPETITIONS CATALOGUE

Jean-Pierre Chupin, PhD, Professor, Architect MOAQ, MIRAC

Université de Montréal, Research Chair on Competitions and Contemporary Practices in Architecture, LEAP lab (leap-architecture.org), CA

This paper, a theoretical essay even more so than an empirical study, suggests specific and innovative ways in which articles and editorials on competitions may be interpreted based on a preliminary comparative analysis conducted by the University Research Chair on Competitions at the Université de Montréal. Our corpus of editorials, written clearly and concisely by some thirty authors, steadily refer to the valuable online resource, the Canadian Competitions Catalogue (www.ccc.umontreal.ca), a large digital archive open to the public since 2006. These editorials offer a selection of more than sixty selected Canadian architectural competitions from the last 70 years, emphasizing the contemporary period.

In this paper, we revisit the axes of an epistemological orientation mode, designed as a “Theory and Thesis Compass”, first published in the Cahiers de la recherche architecturale et urbaine in December 2014 and originally addressed to doctorate students during their reflection on the elements of debate – or controversy – on what can, or should be, a doctoral thesis in architecture (CHUPIN, 2015, 2014). This new theoretical model, grounded on the parallelism between doctoral and theoretical writing, can be extrapolated to analyse ‘writing on competitions’ as it is currently tested as a prototypical mapping of editorials in the CCC.

Keywords: architectural writing, architectural theory, critical writing, competition editorials, Canadian competitions

BEYOND ILLUSIONS – TOWARDS A COMMENSURABLE EVALUATION OF COMPETITION PROPOSALS

Tiina Merikoski, Landscape Architect (MSc)

PhD Candidate, Aalto University Department of Build Environment, FI

A key element in planning competitions is the visual material produced by the competing design teams in order to represent how they have imagined the future environment for the competition site. Guidelines for this imagery are given in a competition brief, which aim (1) to

ensure that the design transmits the necessary knowledge, and (2) to mitigate the challenge of representational differences between the variety of proposals.

Even so, part of the art of architectural representation is to visualize the imagined environment in a way that does not merely present the knowledge embedded in the design but also aims to appeal to the emotions, and to provoke the imagination of the viewer.

The paper presents a method to mitigate this challenge. The key features in proposals to an invitational competition were redrawn, and layered against each other in order to get an undisturbed understanding on the differences between them. These comparisons ignored the visual rhetoric, which makes comparing the proposals complicated in a way that is not always consciously acknowledged.

The paper is framed by a two-year research project in which sustainable solutions for Nordic tourism destinations were investigated.

Keywords: Planning competition, Visual rhetoric, Image, Evaluation, Architectural representation

JUDGEMENT IN ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITIONS AS COMMUNICATIVE DELIBERATIVE PRACTICE

Naghm Al-Qaysi¹, Poorang Piroozfar², Ryan Southall³, Eric R. P. Farr⁴

¹ School of Art, Design and Media, University of Brighton, UK

² School of Environment and Technology, University of Brighton, UK

³ School of Art, Design and Media, University of Brighton, UK

⁴ NONAMES Design Research Foundation, USA

The judgement process in architectural competitions has long been considered as one of the most complex and controversial practices. This, on one hand, is because of architecture itself and the multi-faceted nature of the architectural design, and on the other, for the complexion of the judgement process and the diversity of stakeholders involved in the decision process. Framing the judgement process as a democratic practice, this paper aims to explore the nature of the judgement process in architectural competitions, utilizing deliberative democracy as a frame of reference, through comparative critical analysis approach to the existing body of knowledge. The communicative action theory is used as a model by which negotiations or communications leading to the decision in judgement process of an architectural competition can be integrated in the process and understood from a new angle. Laying foundation for future research, this paper argues that, in order to reach a rational mutual decision, dialogic and instrumental deliberation are both essential to a successful judgement process in architectural competitions. In addition, conducting an effective communication between all the stakeholders involved in the decision process to promote transparency, is vital to reach a common understanding that allows for sharing a common ground to reach consensus.

Keywords: Architectural competitions, judgement, communicative action, deliberative democracy

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Nagham Al-Qaysi is a practicing architect and was a lecturer in the Department of Architecture, University of Technology, in Baghdad, Iraq, where she acted as a module leader for Architectural Presentation and Freehand Drawing, and also served as a member of architectural design studio team for more than twelve years. Her research, in architecture theory, focuses on aesthetics of architecture and architectural judgement. She is currently a Ph.D. student at College of Art, Design and Media, University of Brighton.

Jonas E Andersson Architect SAR/ MSA and Ph. D. at the KTH School of Architecture, Royal Institute of Technology, KTH, Stockholm, Sweden, and affiliated with the Swedish Agency for Participation, MFD. Recent publication: ‘A Universal Space for Ageing. Demographic Changes, Eldercare and Competitions in Denmark, Norway and Sweden’. In: *Architecture Competitions and the Production of Culture, Quality and Knowledge: An International Inquiry*. Editors J.P. Chupin, C. Cucuzzella and Helal. B. Montreal: Potential Architecture Books, 2014.

Dr Chrissy Buse is a Research Fellow on the ESRC funded ‘Buildings in the Making’ project. She gained a first class degree in Sociology and Psychology in Liverpool, then completed an MSc in Social Research Methods at the University of Manchester and a PhD in Sociology at the University of York. Chrissy’s PhD examined older people’s usage of new information and communication technologies. She has since worked as a researcher at the Universities of Leeds and Kent, and has authored and co-authored academic papers on the topics of ageing, technology, embodiment, dementia, and material culture.

Christakis Chatzichristou, PhD, is currently an Associate Professor of Architecture at the University of Cyprus. Taught at Pratt Institute in New York (Visiting Professor, Spring 2010), the American University of Beirut, and the Lebanese American University (2002-2003). Received his first degree in Architectural Engineering in 1986 from the University of Texas at Austin and a Master of Architecture in 1991 from the same institution. Awarded a PhD. in Architecture from the Bartlett School of Graduate Studies at the University College London in 2002. Through sketches and paintings, he examines issues in visual perception which are central to architectural debates as well. A keynote speaker in the 31st Conference of IAPL (International Association for Philosophy and Literature) in 2007. Received a number of awards in architectural competitions and participated in the Venice Architecture Biennale for Cyprus in 2006 and 2008. He was selected to curate the Cyprus Pavilion at the Architecture Venice Biennale in 2010.

Jean-Pierre Chupin is Professor at the Université de Montréal School of Architecture, where he holds the Research Chair on Competitions and Contemporary Practices in Architecture and co-directs of the Laboratoire d’étude de l’architecture potentielle (L.E.A.P.). The first volume of his research on analogy and theory in architecture has been published in French in 2010, republished in 2013, by Swiss Infolio Editions. Prof. Chupin conducts research projects on contemporary architecture, competitions processes, tectonics, judgement, excellence and experimentation. He coordinates the ongoing updates of two major competition databases (libraries of projects): in Canada (Canadian Competitions Catalogue www.ccc.umontreal.ca) and in Europe (EUROPAN-FRANCE competitions (1989-2009)). Along with Carmela Cucuzzella and Bechara Helal, he published a comprehensive international survey in 2015: *Architecture Competitions and the Production of Culture, Quality and Knowledge (An International Inquiry)* (Montreal, Potential Architecture Books).

Anghelos Coulon is a Design student at Concordia University, and a research assistant at the Concordia University Research Chair IDEAS-BE (Integrated Design Ecology and Sustainability for the Built Environment). He holds a master’s degree in International Relations from Shandong University (China) and has now set his sights on environmental design and sustainable development.

Rebecca Crabtree is a qualified architect specialising in residential architecture. Rebecca studied for her BArch at Edinburgh College of Art before going on to complete her studies at the Architectural

Association School of Architecture. Rebecca has worked for award-winning studios in Leeds, Edinburgh and London where she worked closely with domestic and developer clients. She has worked as graphic designer and curator on a monograph of architectural ceramicist Tony Cumella. Recently Rebecca established her own architectural practice (P/ARC) in order to combine professional practice with academic research (in the areas of architect-client communication, built-environment education for children and co-design).

Dr Carmela Cucuzzella holds a Concordia University Research Chair in Integrated Design and Sustainability for the Built Environment (IDEAS-BE). She has a background in various facets of design, holding degrees in Computer Science, Design Art, a Masters in Design and Complexity and a PhD in Environmental Design. Her research work is framed within the broad domain of design studies where she investigates questions and practices of sustainable design for public spaces and places. Her theoretical framework revolves around questions of qualitative judgment in design thinking by considering the interrelated dimensions of the cognitive-instrumental, the moral-practical and the aesthetic-expressive forms of discourse and judgment.

Davidson/ Rafailidis: **Stephanie Davidson** and **Georg Rafailidis** are faculty at the School of Architecture and Planning, State University of New York at Buffalo, USA. They taught previously at the RWTH Aachen University, Germany. Both practice architecture as Davidson Rafailidis. www.davidsonrafailidis.net

Dr Eric R. P. Farr is a critic, educator, researcher, architect and urban designer, with a track record of promoting the role of women and ethnical groups in architecture and design. He is founding principal of NONAMES design research foundation and acts as the coordinator of architecture and urban theory and history at New School of Architecture and Design where he runs comprehensive design studios and a super studio on verticality. His research focuses are intramural built environment, objects, methods and processes, digital design and fabrication, integrated systems design, fuzzy logic, (Mass-) customization and personalization, facade and envelope systems.

Michel Geertse studied law and art history at the VU University, Amsterdam, where he received a PhD in international urban planning networks in the early twentieth century. He works as legal policy advisor at the Royal Institute of Dutch Architects (BNA). His professional and academic interests focus on the influence of structural frames (professional, political, social and cultural institutions) on the production, performance and reception of architecture and urban design.

Bechara Helal is a doctoral student in Architecture at the Université de Montréal. He holds a Bachelor in Engineering (École Polytechnique) as well as a Bachelor and a Master in Architectural Design (Université de Montréal). His research thesis, conducted within the LEAP (Laboratoire d'Étude de l'Architecture Potentielle) and directed by Professor Jean-Pierre Chupin, deals with the emergence of the laboratory in architectural theory and practice as a space of research and production of knowledge.

Cilly Jansen (Amsterdam, 1957) studied history of architecture at the University of Amsterdam. Since then she works in the field of art and architecture. In 1993 she founded Architectuur Lokaal, independent national centre of expertise and information devoted to commissioning building development in The Netherlands. Within this organization in 1997 she founded the Fulcrum for Procurement & Design Competitions. Since 1986 she is involved in architect selections and architecture prizes in The Netherlands and Flanders (presidency, jury member, procedures); she lectures in The Netherlands and abroad on public commissioning and architecture policy and she was editor in chief of the *Architectuur Lokaal quarterly* 1993-2013.

Elias Kranos, is a PhD candidate and currently working as a Teaching Instructor at the University of Cyprus. He received his degree in Architectural Engineering in 2009 from The National Technical University of Athens (NTUA). In the past he has worked for the Cypriot firm Armeftis & Associates (2010-2013), winning the 1st price for the architectural competition regarding the Design and

Restoration of the Lanition Schools in Limassol, Cyprus. He also participated in conferences presenting papers: 10th International Space Syntax Symposium in London 2015 - International conference, Bio-cultural, Sustainability in Architectural Cultural Heritage, Limassol, Cyprus, December 2015 - International conference, HOUSED by CHOICE HOUSED by FORCE - Homes, Conflicts and Conflicting Interests, Nicosia, Cyprus, January 2016.

Florian Kossak is Senior Lecturer for Urban History, Theory and Design at the Sheffield School of Architecture where he is founding member of AGENCY. He studied architecture in Berlin and Glasgow and received his PhD from the Edinburgh College of Art. He was co-founder of the co-operative GLAS Ltd. He has curated exhibitions in Germany, France, Italy and the UK and is author of numerous articles, architectural monographs, and catalogues concerned with the mediation of architecture and urbanism.

Linda Leitāne-Šmīdberga (1984) is an architect holding Professional Diploma and Master Degree in Arch. from the Riga Technical University (Latvia). She has worked in architecture offices in Riga, most notably "SZK and Partners" and "NRJA". As a member of different teams she has participated in more than 30 local and international architecture competitions. She has also been co-curator ("NRJA") of Latvian national exhibition "Unwritten" at The 14th Venice Architecture biennale (2014), dedicated to extensive research about modernism architecture in Latvia. Since 2015 she is member of the board at Latvian Association of architects, curating architecture competitions.

Dr **Daryl Martin** graduated with a first class English degree from Lancaster University. He has worked in a range of areas, before returning to study at York, where he completed a Masters and PhD in urban sociology. He has published academic papers on the sociological aspects of contemporary architecture and planning, with a particular interest in the work of Will Alsop and Cedric Price. He currently lectures on a range of sociological topics, including a module which builds on his doctoral research on the development of domestic, industrial and civic architecture in Northern English cities.

Professor **Sarah Nettleton** completed her first degree in social science at the University of Newcastle and went on to gain an MSc and then PhD in medical sociology at the University of London. She has over 30 years of experience researching issues relating to health and illness and published extensively, in particular on matters relating to embodied experiences of health and disease and the contingent nature of medical knowledge and diagnosis. She is Principal Investigator on the ESRC-Funded project, 'Buildings in the Making: A Sociological Exploration of Architecture in the Context of Health and Social Care'.

Walter Menteth RIBA, FRIAS is a lead consultant architect; director of Wealter Menteth Architects and part time lecturer at the Portsmouth School of Architecture. He has won and judged various architectural competitions, and written extensively on competitions and procurement. He is a director of the UK's first architectural procurement intelligence service, Project Compass CIC (est. 2014) and is a founder member of thefulcrum.eu, a digital pan european architectural competitions and procurement intelligence service and network. Walter is an RIBA National Councillor, was chair of the RIBA Procurement Reform Group 2011 → 2013 and synthesised many of the RIBA's responses during consultations stages leading to adoption of Public Works Directive EU 2014/24. He was a member of the UK Cabinet Office SME Panel 2011 → 2015. For his work entitled 'Pathways to construction Procurement reform' Walter received the RIBA President's Medal for Research 2015 and RIBA President's Award for Practice-located Research in 2015.

Tiina Merikoski is a landscape architect M.Sc. and a PhD candidate at the Aalto University Department of Build Environment. Her main interests of research have been sustainable land use, planning, and transformative innovations. In her research, she has been working with architectural competition projects as well as with the development of tourism destinations. Currently she explores architectural competitions and transdisciplinary knowledge production in the light of planning for sustainability in her PhD research.

Leif Östman is an architect with a PhD from the School of Architecture in Stockholm. His research interest is in design processes, architect competitions and pragmatist philosophy. Currently he is teaching at Novia, University of Applied Sciences in Finland.

Dr Merle Patchett: Merle's research broadly focuses on theories, histories, and geographies of practice. This focus has led her to engage empirically with a range of specialised skills (e.g. taxidermy and millinery), practitioners (e.g. artists and architects), and places of practice (e.g. museums, galleries and archives) and to develop practice-based methodologies. Now a Lecturer in Human Geography at the University of Bristol, Merle curated Strip Appeal while working with Rob Shields as a Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Alberta.

Dr Poorang Piroozfar is an architect, a principal lecturer and the Academic Programme Leader for Architectural Technology at University of Brighton, where he also serves on School Research Strategy Committee and acts as the director of Built Environment Research Group (BERG). The interaction between theory and practice has been in the centre of his attention where he has examined manifestation of green urbanisation, all-inclusivity in urban design and most recently, values and frames in design for sustainability as well as the judgment processes in architecture.

Together, Craig Stott and Simon Warren are **Project Office** co-directors and senior architecture lecturers at the Leeds School of Architecture, Leeds Beckett University. They run the BA studio CITYzen Agency which situates its explorations in neglected places of post-industrial cities. They consider global imperatives and local issues together, exploring their interconnection and consequence of each on the other. The studio is linked to Project Office, which is a design and research collaboration of staff and students working on live projects. It is a registered architecture consultancy concerned with ethical, social and resilient architecture and design. Project Office works with like-minded communities, organisations and individuals.

Magnus Rönn, Associate Professor, The School of Architecture, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. I have a position as research leader at the School of Architecture. In 2006 I was qualified as Professor in architecture by Professor Anne Marie Wilhelmsen. Together with colleagues I have been editor in chief for publishing four special issues on competitions in scientific journals, *The Nordic Journal of Architectural Research* (2009, No 2/3; 2012, No 1) and *FROMakademisk* (2013, No 4; 2014, No 1). I have also published four books on competitions, two anthologies in English (2008, 2013) and two monographs in Swedish (2005, 2013).

Birgitte Sauge (b.1961) is senior curator in the Architecture Department at the National Museum of Art, Architecture and Design and editor of the Norwegian journal *Norsk museumstidsskrift*. She has a doctorate in art history from the University of Bergen (2004). Her research focuses on Norwegian architectural history from the 20th century, architectural competitions, documentation and archives. 2016-2019 she holds a research position in the interdisciplinary project *Architecture Museums and Digital Design Media*, part of the larger project *Mediascapes – Cultural Heritage Mediascape*, organized by the Department of Education, University of Oslo and financed by the Norwegian Research Council.

Professor Rob Shields: Rob's work spans architecture, urban geography and sociology. He brings an interdisciplinary and global perspective to research on urban cultures, including the built environments of social spaces. He has a wide range of fieldwork experience in the Canadian North, Europe, China and Brazil. As an endowed Research Chair, he directs participatory urban research and design projects that leverage public curiosity and art and practice-based approaches. His publications include *The City Region in Prospect*, *Building Tomorrow*, *Innovation in Construction and Engineering*, *Spatial Questions*, *The Virtual*, *Lifestyle Shopping*, *Cultures of Internet* and *Places on the Margin* as well as strip-appeal.com and spaceandculture.com

Dr Jan Silberberger is a Post-Doc researcher at ETH Wohnforum – ETH CASE (Centre for Research on Architecture, Society & the Built Environment), Department of Architecture, ETH Zurich, Switzerland. He has studied Architecture and Urban Planning at the University of Stuttgart/Germany and Visual Communication and Fine Arts at the Hochschule fuer bildende Kuenste in Hamburg, Germany. In 2011 he finished his PhD studies at the University of Fribourg's Geography Unit. His research focuses on decision-making within planning processes.

Dr Lina Stergiou is Associate Professor of Architecture at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, China, creative director of 4Life Strategies, a non-profit organization for strategically design cross-disciplinary actions for life as agencies for change, and principal of LS/Architecture&Strategies, an award-winning design research lab. Independent Expert for the Mies van der Rohe Award -European Union Prize for Contemporary Architecture. A Princeton University Stanley J.Seeger Research Fellow and recipient of numerous research grants, her research explores spatial politics and the avant-garde, including her forthcoming book on *The Concept of the Avant-Garde in Twentieth and Twenty-First Century Architecture*.

Craig Stott Having originally trained as a structural engineer, Craig's research interest now lies in the implementation of Ecological and Social Sustainability to create Closed Loop Urbanism through the pedagogic tool of 'Live' project learning in architectural education. The concept suggests that by understanding material resource flows within a city, it is possible to implement a series of systems where nothing is disposed of and everything reused, i.e. zero waste. This offers humanity a potential method of restabilising an environmental equilibrium with the earth.

Dr Ignaz Strebel is a geographer within the research unit ETH Wohnforum – ETH CASE (Centre for Research on Architecture, Society & the Built Environment), Faculty of Architecture, ETH Zurich. He took his PhD at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland in 2003. He was previously a researcher in geography and architecture at the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, and his recent work has focussed on the urban geographies shaped in work settings, such as, for example, building care, research laboratories, and the offices of building administration, planning firms and housing administration.

Dr Ryan Southall is a building physicist with extensive experience in the modelling and monitoring of buildings. He is currently a Senior Lecturer within the University of Brighton's Architecture programme teaching undergraduate technology from an environmental/experiential perspective.

Simon Warren is an architect and Senior Lecturer at the Leeds School of Architecture, where he leads the Post Graduate Diploma in Architectural Professional Practice (RIBA/ARB Part 3) course. By thinking about strategic urban design issues and by understanding and empowering the resources within communities the city can be made more resilient, egalitarian and coherent. As a practicing architect Simon has been involved in built projects across the north of England from 1992 to 2008, and was a director at Leeds practice Bauman Lyons Architects. Simon is currently working towards the PhD 'Live Project Pedagogy - Architecture in the Making'.