

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT COMPETITION

The Akamas Landscapes Between Science and Myth

JURY PROTOCOL

Key Dates of the LE:NOTRE Institute Student Competition

Working period: 20.10.2015 – 31.01.2016 (23:59 CET)

Registered teams and/or individuals: 164 teams registered from 37 countries

Submissions received: 24, from 13 countries

Wrong submissions: 1 (wrong submission area)

The entire competition including the blind jury review has been managed via the ILIAS platform of HfWU Nürtingen-Geislingen. An online feedback colloquium was held in November.

Composition of the competition jury

The jury was composed of local and international experts in the fields of nature protection, landscape architecture, landscape planning, urban design and architecture.

The jury was composed as follows:

- Professor Teresa Andresen, University of Porto, (PT)
- Univ. Ass. Werner Rolf, landscape planner, TU Munich, (DE)
- Jamie Liversedge, landscape architect, London, (UK)
- Professor Vera Tangari, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, (Brazil)
- Dr. Andreas Christou, Forester-Environmentalist, Department of Forests, Head of Forest Management Office (CY)
- Dr. Kyriakos Themistocleous, architect, Board Member of Technical Chamber of Cyprus (CY)
- and the winning team of the 2015 LE:NOTRE Competition: Maria Alexandrescu (master urbanism TU Delft), Ioana Ionescu (master urbanism TU Delft), Claudiu Forgaci (cand. PhD TU Delft)

The LE:NOTRE Institute Board and the Cyprus Landscape Forum Organisation Team wish to express their gratitude to the careful and profound work of the competition jury.

Evaluation method and process

All projects were submitted anonymously bearing an identification code only. Each project was made available online to the evaluators via the ILIAS platform.

Round 1

The first round of evaluations took place in the period 01. – 07.02.2016 and was organized as follows: the jury was divided in 3 x 3 persons and each group of jury members evaluated 8 projects each. Each project thus received a blind review from three different evaluators. The evaluations were collected online via a survey system. None of the evaluators was able at any time to see the others' evaluations in order to enable neutral perspectives on each project.

The evaluation sheet contained five criteria, as already outlined in the competition brief:

1. Connection to the landscape context
2. Creativity
3. Concept and method
4. Holistic approach
5. Visual quality

Each criterion was ranked at a scale 1-4, 4 being the highest score. In addition, each criterion was commented in written form plus a concluding general comment.

In addition, it was assessed if the project responded to the following competition objectives:

- Sustainable visions balancing the interplay of landscape scenery, habitat management, visitor flow and settlement development
- Enhancing, interpreting and integrating heritage elements and historical layers
- Concepts for nature-oriented tourism and environmental education focussing on the exploration of natural phenomena
- Sustainable traffic concepts, connectivity, enhancing modal shift and increased landscape experience by alternative means of transport
- Enhancement of ecological functions and ecosystem services
- Introduction of green infrastructure elements
- Exploring any possible landscape-based assets creating possibilities for small enterprises in order to foster the landscape's socio-economic foundation

The maximum ranking a project could achieve in the first round was 60.

The best third was supposed to continue to the second round, the threshold being at **40 total points**, which was achieved by 12 projects.

The following projects continued to the second round:

Score	ID
47	007
57	015
53	038
42	045
48	056
53	082
50	083
40	084
47	085
41	110
42	118
42	128

163 reached 37 but was proposed by one jury member to be included in the second round.

Round 2

The remaining 13 projects received additional three evaluations from different evaluator groups. Consequently, each project received 6 different blind reviews. Again, the evaluators were not able to view each other's comments at any time. This second review was conducted in the period 08.02.-10.02.2016.

The maximum potential score of the second round was 120.

The result of this second evaluation round shows as follows:

Score	ID
91	007
102	015

97	038
91	045
98	056
99	083
105	084
92	085
92	110
92	118
72	128
73	163
73	178

Follow-up rounds 1 + 2

After approval of this protocol the authors of the projects that did not reach the threshold of 40 will be informed by e-mail. They will also receive a summary of the jury evaluation. All projects will be shown at the landscape forum in Pafos from March 16 – 20, 2016. All teams are invited to attend the exhibition opening.

Third round with finalists

The five projects reaching the best evaluations from the second round were selected for the online colloquium on the finalists which took place on Thursday, 11th of February, from 18 30 – 20 00 pm CET via Adobe Connect. The jury members were invited to suggest further projects of the second round for closer consideration. Projects 118 and 85 were suggested.

The jury discussed the following projects: 15, 38, 56, 83, 84, 85 and 118.

As a general observation it was agreed that all projects of this closer consideration made valuable suggestions for the development of the Akamas landscape and none of them was able to respond to every aspect of the competition brief. Especially the consideration of the very specific and protected flora of the area was not addressed by most projects.

After a review and discussion the jury voted on the first three ranges and possibly 'Honorably mentions'.

The voting produced the following results:

1st Prize	084
2nd Prize	015 and 056
3rd Prize	083
Honorably mentioned:	038 and 085

Observations

Project 084: This is a well-presented and balanced project with a strong conceptual vision. It has a very holistic approach, with the Geopark as a long term target, taking into account sustainable regional development. The project really intends to integrate ecology, culture and preservation issues, dealing with the diversity as presented by Greek and Turkish values. The project shows a very good understanding of the local history, it articulates the three scales very well and uses strong precedents and concepts in building up the design.

Project 015: The project is well balanced, although some analyses remained implicit. The strategy and design are firm and well-presented and the project moves through all required scales. The project integrates social, ecological and economic dimensions. The merger of the two villages is courageous, but risky and the future consequences needed more exploration. The proposal emphasizes the proactive dimension of this ancient landscape, approaching it with a good understanding of a cultural landscape. A further positive observation is the existence of a mobility concept.

Project 056: This is a very comprehensive concept, connecting landscape, agricultural use and tourism. This work considers landscape potentials as well as landscape sensitivity and proposes appropriate solutions. Although Green Infrastructure is not explicitly mentioned as a concept this conceptual approach considers central GI planning principles in particular connectivity. The project is well-presented. However, the Greek Antikythera mechanism concept used in the Astro Park did not link successfully to the rest of the project. A further weakness is the development in close proximity to the Natura 2000 sites.

Project 083: The project's aspects are well integrated, consistent with a strong idea. The use of water scarcity as a backbone for the transect's development is very strong, as is the emphasis on economic self-sustainability and future local investments in economic growth. It is unclear however how the Astro Park connects the villages with the blue thread. The focus that this proposal has (key technical interventions and a smart use of local natural, agricultural, and cultural assets) is impressive. The Astro Park comes with a subtle intervention that blends with the landscape.

Honorable mentions:

Project 038: This is a thoughtful concept, linking sustainable tourism, landscape scenery, and cultural heritage. Furthermore the so called "Two Leaves" builds an interesting approach, linking the sea with the rural hinterland. However, it lacks a reference to the community's involvement which is important in the context. Some visual options did not help much but the proposal was clear in most of the graphic pieces. The Astro Park makes good use of existing site features (materials, topography).

Project 085: The project is clear, well structured, and well presented. It proposes a well integrated, inter-scalar approach that combines functional aspects (economic, ecological, cultural) with an attractive narrative (constellation Astro Park, mythology), while remaining site-specific in its interventions. The project was selected for the 'honorable mention' section because of the original idea to decentralize the Astro Park across the territory.

Distribution of Prizes by the Landscape Forum Organization

Prize still need to be defined by the forum organization and will be communicated to the winning teams shortly.

Identification of Finalists

ID	Prize	University	Team
084	1st	University College Ghent, Belgium	Niels de Courvreur, Tobias van der Elst, Joren Jodts, Maarten Dox
015	2nd (1)	National School of Higher studies in Nature and Landscape Architecture-Blois, France, and Harvard Graduate School of Design, USA	Philippe Allignet Sophia Geller
056	2nd (2)	Sapienta Hungarian University of Transsylvania, Romania	Patka Zsuzsa-Kincső, Lorant Kovacs, Botond Szabo, Emöke Gereb, Julia Nagy
083	3rd	University College Ghent, Belgium	Guillaume Vanden Avenne, Thomas Dreesen, Gus van Hoeck, Robin, Vangheluwe
Honorable mention			
038		Huazhong Agriculture University, China	Luo Huan, Xu Xiaoyu, Wang Lun, Chen Wenshuang, Li Yuan, Guo Yue, Li Jiajia
085		University College Ghent, Belgium	Fleur Vergote, Nona de Baerdemaecker, Rinus Vanderlinden, Pepijn Verbeeck

Follow-up:

Prize-winning authors/groups will be informed after approval of the protocol about the evaluations and the outcome. A ceremony and exhibition will be organized at the Landscape Forum in Paphos from March 16 – 20, 2016. Results will be documented and published (digitally).

Addendum:

A wrongly submitted project (Nr. 101) was discovered only after the jury finished its evaluation process. The project was submitted in the area for the author declarations. It could not be considered for evaluation but will be shown as part of the forum exhibition.

Competition organizing committee:

Coordination of participants, jury working process and protocol:

for the LE:NOTRE Institute Dr.-Ing. Ellen Fetzer

Preparation of competition brief, materials and jury formation:

Neapolis University of Pafos, Cyprus:

Dr. Julia Georgi, Ass. Professor, Head of the Department Architecture, Land and Environment

Local experts:

Ing. Antonia Theodosiou, Director of the Akamas area

Ing. Ioannis Koutsolambros, Board Member of Pafos 2017

Nürtingen, 17th of February 2016

Dr. Ellen Fetzer for the LE:NOTRE Institute