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Aalto University became a reality at the beginning of 2010 when three major Finnish universities – the Helsinki School of Economics, the University of Art and Design Helsinki, and the Helsinki University of Technology – merged as part of a reform of the country’s university system. The creation of Aalto University underlines the dynamism of modern-day Finland. Without the commitment of the academic, political, and business communities, and their ability to work toward a shared vision of the future, the new university would have been impossible. The success of Aalto University has already proved the unique drive behind the idea, and has been reflected in numerous international visits, extensive international media interest – and, above all, in the growing collaboration that is developing between the university’s schools.

The most important goal of Aalto University is to strengthen Finland’s international competitiveness, success, and the multidisciplinary dynamism of Finnish society. The university’s national goals complement its commitment to an international identity and building a better world for everyone. The major underlying challenges and problems that the world faces today are not national in nature, but are common the world over. In addition to revamping and revitalising the organisational structure of the universities that went into its creation, Aalto University has also set its sights on encouraging people to boldly develop new ways of thinking, break down old boundaries, approach problems in new ways, and develop new and more sustainable ways of working together.

Encouraging different fields to work closer together and develop new types of dialogue calls for an environment that will help them do just that, and this is why the university has decided to concentrate its activities in one core location and transform Otaniemi into a new kind of environment where students and researchers can interact and flourish in exciting and novel ways. Combining the existing infrastructure with the new will create the foundation for Otaniemi to develop into a dynamic university city of the future.

Creating a dynamic campus such as this calls for new design solutions and opening up the university to its stakeholders, the public at large, and its partners. The City of Espoo is a key partner in developing and implementing the new Otaniemi campus, and is working closely with us to build our new future.
The ambitious goals set for the Campus 2015 Competition reflected the ambition of Aalto University’s vision. Seamless cooperation between all those involved, underpinned by that vision, helped ensure its success. Aalto University, Aalto Properties Ltd., and the members of the competition jury in particular played a central role here. The competition proved an exciting adventure for all of us and gave us new insights into what the new campus could offer us.

The practical aspects of the competition were demanding. The university’s expectations for the new facilities, the site itself in the centre of Otaniemi, and the idea of a building designed from the ground up to encourage and promote new forms of interaction called for a broad-ranging approach that set the ground rules for the competition and judging the entries. The jury and experts had their work cut out for them, and extensive consideration was given to each and every decision. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those involved for their contribution to the debate that took place and the ideas that everyone brought to the table to help us envision our new campus.

The competition attracted extensive interest and we received a total of 189 high-quality entries, presenting the jury with a very challenging task to select the design that would best reflect the university’s vision of a solution capable of bringing people and different fields together and encouraging them to interact in new and productive ways. The winning entry respects the existing architecture of the area and is flexible in terms of adapting to future needs. The new building will play an important role in creating new opportunities for the Aalto University of the future and how it responds and adapts to changing teaching and research requirements. Although the main user of the building will be the School of Arts, Design and Architecture, it is very much intended to provide an open forum for all of the university’s schools and activities – for everyone.

The Otaniemi campus is one of Alvar Aalto’s major designs, and the competition and the jury were very committed to respecting the existing environment and the philosophy behind it. The same commitment is also reflected in the choice of the university’s name, which highlights the role that Alvar Aalto – as a multitalented, internationally recognised architect and designer – played in developing Finnish society, opening Finland up to the international community, and building its future. Giving technology a human face and making it a force for commercial endeavour were central to Alvar Aalto’s work.

These ideas were also central to the Campus 2015 Competition. We want the new environment that will result to encourage new generations of young talent to think in new ways and interact with the people around them in new and exciting ways. The outcome of the competition should provide Aalto University with an even stronger framework for turning its vision into reality and making Otaniemi a dynamic and vibrant university city of the future.

Helena Hyvönen
Chairperson of the Competition Jury
Dean
1.1 ORGANISER, CHARACTER, AND AIM OF THE COMPETITION

Aalto University Properties Ltd. arranged an architectural competition for the design of Aalto University’s Otaniemi central campus and its main buildings. The competition was arranged as a general international competition in two phases. **Phase 1** consisted of designing a lively central campus area for Aalto University and the entire science and research community in Otaniemi. **Phase 2** of the competition focused on the detailed design of the new building of Aalto university School of Arts, Design and Architecture (Aalto ARTS Building) complex and its immediate surroundings for the university’s core functions.

The boundaries of the competition area were defined by the main building of the former Helsinki University of Technology and the Main Library, both designed by Alvar Aalto, and a number of other buildings of cultural and historical value. The hope was that the new building(s) would reflect change and the new era at Otaniemi.

The total area to be implemented was specified in **Phase 2** as **47,000 m²** gross floor area. The winning proposal will form the basis of the eventual detailed plan of the competition area and the plans for the campus’ new building(s).

1.2 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

**Phase 1** assessment criteria goals to be reached were:

- Unique solution
- Usability as a learning environment and a centre for research and art
- Quality of urban landscape and architecture
- Ecological sustainability
- Feasibility.

The same criteria were primarily used in **Phase 2**, but on a more detailed level.

1.3 THE COMPETITION JURY

Competition entries were judged by a jury.

Aalto University was represented on the jury by

Helena Hyvönen, Dean, Professor (chair)
Tuula Teeri, President
Turkka Keinonen, Professor
Aija Staffans, Architect
Johan Celsing, Architect, Professor, Stockholm
Elina Tenho, Architecture student (student member)

Representatives of Aalto University Properties Ltd

Kari Kontturi, Managing Director

Representatives of the Alvar Aalto Foundation

Vilhelm Helander, Architect, Emeritus Professor
Representatives of Senate Properties

Tuomo Hahl, Architect

Representatives of the City of Espoo

Jukka Mäkelä, Espoo City Director
Olavi Louko, Technical Services Director
Ossi Keränen, Architect, Director of City Planning and Urban Design

Representatives nominated by the Finnish Association of Architects (SAFA):

Aaro Artto, Architect
Trevor Harris, Architect, Professor

Professional members constituted the majority of the jury.

External specialists:

Pekka Saarela, Development Manager
Seppo Junnila, Professor, Sustainable Development
Seppo Karppinen, M.Sc. (Eng.), Traffic
Arto Palo, M.Sc. (Eng.).
Tapio Holopainen, Engineer, Costs

Eija Larkas-Ipatti, Architect, Pöyry Finland Oy acted as project specialist and jury secretary.

1.4 COMPETITION RULES
The competition was arranged in accordance with Finnish law, the competition programmes 1 and 2, and the competition rules of the Finnish Association of Architects.

1.5 COMPETITION LANGUAGE
The language of the competition was English.

1.6 PRIZES OF THE COMPETITION
The total prize sum in the competition was 300,000 EUR.

Each candidate that qualified for Phase 2 received 20,000 EUR as soon as an approved entry for Phase 2 was received.

The rest of the prize money – 180,000 EUR – will be distributed in Phase 2.
A total of 189 proposals were received by the deadline on 10 August 2012.

The proposals were put on show to the general public from 1 to 12 October 2012. A picture of each proposal was also published on the competition website, and the public had the opportunity to give their comments on the proposals.

The jury held six meetings at which proposals were evaluated. The preparatory work group also convened several times. The jury requested expert analyses for 12 proposals (traffic, ecology, scope, and costs).

Communities at Otaniemi and an evaluation team from VTT State Technical Research Centre of Finland commented on the best proposals in various workshops.

The jury selected six candidates for Phase 2 at its meeting on 16 November 2012.
Phase 1 General Evaluation

3.1 GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF ENTRIES
The competition assignment proved to be challenging, as expected. Finding an appropriate way of renewing a central part of Alvar Aalto’s well-known campus university area is a daunting task for any architect or urban planner. As if this task is not enough, the organisers were also looking for solutions that would set a whole new direction and tone for the future development of Finland’s newest and most ambitious university concept: Aalto University.

The competition attracted a large number of entries, 189 in all. In keeping with the nature of a conceptual competition, the spectrum of ideas was broad and the emphases in different entries varied significantly. Despite the high quality of many of the entries, none succeeded completely in addressing all of the goals listed in the competition programme or fully taking into account all aspects of the assignment. In a two-stage competition this was only to be expected. Less attention was paid by the entrants to developing the internal planning of the new buildings, a task which received greater attention in the second stage. However the general urban, architectural, and landscape qualities of the best entries were of a very high and promising calibre. The entries produced innovative ideas and concepts for the development of the area and the new school, meeting the expectations set for the first stage of the competition. The entries represent a fair cross-section of current ideas and themes in university development area.

The proposals featured alternative versions of learning environments ranging from low, dense urban village solutions to sculptural and monumental large-scale urban city blocks or individual buildings. The incorporation of an increased range and diversity of services was emphasized in the programme and considered necessary for attracting staff and students in the future. The proposed building typologies predominantly emphasised either deepplan open teaching spaces, supported by more intimate and quieter spaces for individual work, or conventional narrow framed buildings with spaces organized along one or both sides of a corridor, a variant on the ubiquitous office building plan. A large number of entries placed a great deal of the space underground, serviced principally by top lighting. A significant group of entries used the shape of Aalto’s Savoy vase as a geometrical starting point. One of the largest groups of entries could be classified as object-orientated architecture, conceived without respect or concern for the existing context. Generally speaking, this approach did not produce any schemes worthy of further development.

One of the main purposes of the competition was to test the feasibility of incorporating a large building within the existing context of the central area of Otaniemi. The original plan for Otaniemi is based on clusters of faculty or service buildings located in a predominantly former forest and rural manor house landscape. The monumental former main
building is at the centre of this architectural galaxy, acting as the source of an imaginary magnetic field around which the other separate faculty buildings orbit. In the case of the competition site, a major ingredient in the original site composition is the former main building’s high auditorium roof line at the north-east corner of the block. This has acted and will continue to act as the main visual landmark and symbolic centre for the entire campus.

The most important features of the site are its close proximity to this significant building by Aalto, the strategic location of the new metro station entrance within the site, as well as its situation at the crossroads of many major routes within the Otaniemi area. The views outwards and how they have been exploited was one of the main priorities in the further development of the entry chosen for development.

Reference costs were calculated on the basis of the most expensive proposals. In the continuation design process, all proposals will need to be shown to be economically feasible.

3.2 URBAN SOLUTIONS

The competition entries proved that it is possible to realise the given area programme of the Arts Building inside the competition area, despite the size and extent of the large building to be accommodated.

The volume demanded by the space within the new building is definitely larger than in any of the earlier town planning studies for this area. The existing townscape will be subjected to radical changes and the urban development strategy adopted by contestants is of fundamental importance in ensuring the future success of this process. Relying on the architectural treatment of the new buildings alone to resolve the challenges and potential of the site will be insufficient. The best entries demonstrate that a clear urban spatial idea is needed to resolve the pitfalls associated with this area of Otaniemi before any attempt is made to design the more detailed space of the new buildings.

The new metro line and proposed station provide a promising starting-point for the development of the area and the Otaniemi campus as a whole. This new public transport infrastructure will naturally call for an increase in urban density and activity, at least in the vicinity of the new station. The best entries show that it is possible to preserve and enhance the key existing elements of the cultural landscape, the overall greenery, and the old avenues of trees leading to the former main building and library, for example.

Some entries concentrated on introducing vast paved areas, especially west of the former main building. It is questionable if there will be enough urban activity to fill these areas with sufficient life. A higher degree of density close to the metro station appears to offer a more natural solution.
It is questionable if very large open landscaped areas west of the former main building, intended for outdoor activities, sports, and other gatherings, are needed in any case, as Alvarinaukio and the campus area between the former main building and library, east of the former main building’s auditorium, already exist.

The best entries vary between a high degree of new urbanity and a more freely developed open landscape, showing a skilful combination of both aspects. The more promising proposals have succeeded in creating close and well-functioning contacts between the metro station, the new Aalto ARTS Building entrances, and the former main building and library, whilst still respecting the open landscape principles of Aalto’s original design.

3.3 THE RELATION OF THE NEW PROPOSALS TO AALTO’S LANDSCAPE AND BUILDINGS

Aalto’s central idea for Otaniemi was to create a campus dominated by different landscape elements. As we know from the realised plans, the location of the former main building and library took intelligent advantage of the existing elements of the cultural landscape deriving from the old Otaniemi manor period. The dominant part of the former main building stands on the hill on which the former small manor house stood. The old tree-lined avenues were maintained as walks and visual axes leading up to the plaza in front of the auditorium and to the library. Alvarinaukio, the open campus area between the buildings, was developed from the former cultural landscape and its meadows. Other institutions complement this group of former main buildings. Further away, the natural forest hilltops were used for student housing and other institutional buildings.

This original idea of buildings surrounded by greenery has been greatly compromised since completion, especially due to the radical increase in car usage and the vast parking areas that have invaded the former open landscape. The intention – a starting-point for the competition programme – is to locate parking underground in the vicinity of the former main building and the new Arts Building, and it will improve the situation, even if large areas of hitherto open space will be covered by new buildings.

Alvarinaukio, the inner heart of the old campus that unites the former main building wings and the main library, is the most refined and well-preserved part of the Aalto campus. The competition entries do not attempt to touch this area generally speaking. The iconic view from Alvarinaukio westwards against the dominating auditorium is untouched in the majority of proposals. In the best proposals, the height of the new buildings is kept modest to preserve this view. The height of the new buildings west of the auditorium only intrude negatively in a few cases and rule out these proposals from further consideration.

The area west of the former main building is, of course, the most important part of the competition area. It could be considered a very positive factor that Aalto never gave this area a fixed, final form in his many versions for the development of Otaniemi. This also gives a certain degree of freedom in developing and redefining the area. A central requirement is to maintain the link between the buildings in the west of the area and the former main building, both in terms of pedestrian and bicycle routes as well as the implied visual axis. This problem is solved in many different ways in the best entries, either as a more free-flowing landscape axis or in a more urban way with clearly defined streets or an open square. Some entries even show a narrow framed view towards the old auditorium and former
main building entrance, a solution which can be interesting in its own way.

The area on the west side of Otakaari, in front of the Nano Building and opposite the former main building auditorium, has been seen as a potential building site in some entries, for part of the Arts Building or for other purposes. This area calls for some kind of spatial complement, either in the form of buildings or landscaping, as it seems somewhat ‘surplus’ in its present form.

The lime tree avenue, leading from the west towards the library and the entrance to the upper courtyard in front of the old main auditorium, is also a central element in Aalto’s campus design. The best entries have inventively taken advantage of this landscape element, using it as an urban connecting path from the metro station. In some entries, the avenue has been cut or the view has been obstructed by new building volumes. This must be considered a major fault and in conflict with the requirements of the competition programme. This shortcoming could easily be corrected in many proposals, however.

In some of the better entries, an embracing central plaza between the former main building, the Arts Building, and the metro station, is extended to integrate the main library with the new urban spaces. This would act as a natural extension to the old open-air entrance between the former main building and library up to Alvarinaukio, so carefully planned by Aalto, enhancing its role within the overall environment.

The area in front of the south-western side of the library received less attention from most of the entrants. Some of the best entries show that the area just opposite the existing road could be a natural site for a building, either for the School of Arts, Design and Architecture, or even more so for new additional functions. A new building would not require the felling of most of the old trees in the area, which form a positive element in the landscape.

The traffic solution related to the junction south or southwest of the library has been studied in depth in only a few entries. It will be unnecessary to incorporate a large traffic roundabout here, and a prominent tunnel ramp just in front of the library should be avoided.

3.4 AALTO ARTS BUILDING PLANNING PRINCIPLES

Plan typologies ranged from conventional lamella block types organized around central courtyards to deep-plan modular spatial arrangements, articulated by strategically located light wells and/or courtyards. In many entries, the need for developing generic spatial systems, allowing for a fair degree of flexibility and adaptability, had been well understood by competitors. Entries offering conventional narrow-framed block typologies tended to result in long and tedious internal routes and would be difficult to adapt to the idea of providing useful communal areas for workshops or other group activities. This is a clear disadvantage in a solution for the creative arts, where pedagogical methods are primarily based on learning by doing. However, the provision of large joint working areas should not be exaggerated at the expense of providing adequate spaces for individual work. Achieving a realistic balance was more thoroughly addressed in the second stage.

Several entries have located key rooms below ground. In general, however, entries show that
most rooms can be located above ground without creating excessively high building masses. Of course, some sunken courtyards or plazas could be used, but in general, locating important activities and rooms underground should be avoided, considering the resulting milieu and the complications involved in providing adequate daylight for work areas.

Several entries are based on the use of extensive green roof areas. The use of roofs as a landscaping element could be a fruitful starting-point. Green roof solutions are especially useful in terms of providing additional thermal insulation, as well as controlling the discharge of storm rainwater. It is questionable, however, to what extent roof spaces can really be used for active outdoor functions, taking climate factors into consideration. Providing routes across roof structures and viewing or sitting areas can be considered, however. Using some parts of the roofs or upper floors to provide an overview of the campus and even towards the distant archipelago landscape is a positive quality and featured in several of the best entries. Some schemes also suggested generous outdoor terraces or balconies, a welcome feature given the uniqueness of the surroundings.

The best entries include a wide range of potentially stimulating and useful learning spaces, varying in size and volume, as well as an adequate amount of more individual rooms for individual work or study tasks. The best designs also feature hubs, offering opportunities for spontaneous meeting places or enabling departments to overlap and encourage interactive collaboration. Some of the more compact plans appear to offer better potential for achieving a more interesting series of spaces that serve both traditional and more progressive teaching ideas. The long-term potential of spaces to adapt to new and as yet unforeseen changes was deemed to be of central importance. Deep-plan typologies can be more challenging, as large-scale space or technical changes can result in difficulties. Solutions based on interconnected pavilion buildings or a chain of separate buildings are more likely to be able to continue functioning during upgrade projects.

The best entries show that at least a major part of the Arts Building complex can be located in an area southwest of a line running approximately from the Data Building in the west to the old main auditorium. It is, of course, an advantage if different parts of the Arts Building have good internal communications.

The development of the chosen schemes in the second phase offered a better opportunity to assess the relative ability of different types of solution to handle long-term changes. At this stage, it was more important to recognise the potential merits of entries in offering an inspiring and workable learning and studying environment.

3.5 VTT TECHNICAL RESEARCH CENTRE OF FINLAND

The competitors were also required to show how a building expansion of 8,000 m² could best be located within the VTT site.

3.6 ARCHITECTURE

The competition entries feature a wide range of approaches for defining the character of the area further. Finding a suitable and appropriate architectural and landscape-architectural language to complement a national icon is difficult, as it entails a constant struggle between balancing individual artistic ambitions with established communal interests and values. Attempts by some contestants to mimic Aalto’s redbrick grammar
generally failed, as they were generally little more than poor imitations of the original, but some of the best entries offered new and innovative reinterpretations of the existing architectural themes at Otaniemi.

Architecturally, the challenge centres on the creation of a suitable and sympathetic scale for the new large building, the controlled provision of appropriate public external spaces (both approach areas as well as the main arrival plaza or forecourt), and maintaining the prevailing atmosphere of a calm but inspiring environment.

Some of the entries offered an exaggerated layering of themes and seemed to be trying too hard to pile enough ‘architecture’ for several public buildings into one building, while at the same time paying little if any attention to ensuring a fruitful dialogue with the present environment. Continuing the idioms of Aalto’s redbrick campus architecture has a lot to commend itself in a world in which pedagogical trends come and go and divert people’s attention from their immediate priorities. A stable and reassuring atmosphere can help redress the balance. However, in unskilled hands the result can turn out to be dull and repetitive, as was the case in many of the entries.

The central priority here was to find a starting-point that achieved a memorable and inspiring balance between external and internal spatial sequences, whilst clearly relating to the spirit of this unique place naturally and effortlessly. In addition, a conscious effort was made to select entries offering fresh insights and a positive contribution to the on-going debate on new learning environments. The best entries showed exemplary skills in developing places with a highly individual character that also succeeded in striking up a positive dialogue with their older neighbours. The scale and physical extent of Otaniemi are large enough to accept a degree of diversity at both a functional and architectural level. The quality of the competition’s best entries demonstrate that a range of architectural approaches are possible in this context, without debasing or degrading the qualities or status of Aalto’s original environment.

3.7 ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS
As wind is a major challenge, especially during the winter months, the importance of creating a reasonable microclimate and pleasant conditions in outside areas was considered a high priority. Many entries incorporated arcades and other devices to ensure adequate pedestrian protection during adverse weather. These ideas are certainly worth developing, as the university covers a large area and distances between different schools and departments are sometimes quite long.

The use of passive energy sources and other simple energy-saving measures has been considered in many of the entries. The additional investment and life cycle costs and their relative feasibility will need to be further examined in the future development phases of the project. Any solutions should be firmly integrated with the general architectural principles and not ‘bolted on’ as an arbitrary afterthought. More thought is needed
about the overall ecological performance of the buildings, especially in the case of those that have suggested a variety of solutions for both generating and storing alternative energy forms. Simulation software will be needed to assess the advantages of using different sources at different times of the year. The suitability and appropriateness of the building envelopes chosen will need careful study to achieve a workable balance between having a ‘breathing’, easily ventilated building, whilst ensuring minimum heat loss during the coldest part of the year. Consideration should be given to using ‘reactive skin’ solutions for cladding and roof coverings.

3.8 TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Most car parking capacity below ground can be solved independently from the building. Many entries show that locating car parking under a large part of the new buildings is likely to constrain the designs because of the construction techniques and dimensioning needed.

The location of parking beneath the buildings gives rise to additional costs (e.g. deep beams, extra columns) that can be reduced or avoided altogether by siting parking under plaza areas. Special attention should be paid here to ensuring that the quality of the deck level is pleasant and practical with adequate planting. The traffic solution in respect of the junction south of the library building and the tunnel ramp leading down to the underground parking has not been addressed in any detail in most entries. This area should be developed in the second-stage projects. Other solutions than a simple roundabout should be studied. If the south side of the site opposite the library is built on, it would be possible to integrate a ramp.

Access ramp arrangements to basement parking must pay careful attention to sightlines and visibility both to and from entry points. Light traffic routes have been included in all the entries, and the quality of these has been developed in many of the top entries using a robust but sensitive selection of materials.
Phase 1 Individual Evaluation

PRIZE CLASS ENTRIES
ENTRY 011

"stay strong sweetie"

GENERAL

"stay strong sweetie" continues the Otaniemi language in a poetic and effortless way. It fits well into the urban grain structure of the existing campus by adopting the same typology strategy as in Aalto’s buildings: narrow building volumes forming inner courtyards. The proposal has a very strong architectural and aesthetic value, and despite being very sketchy contains a lot of promise and development potential. The strategy adopted is flexible and could withstand changes during the lifespan of the building. While the scheme draws its main strength and charm from Aalto’s classic repertoire of low horizontal forms and a restricted palette of materials, it does not demonstrate convincingly how the strategy can be developed into a series of inspiring teaching and studying spaces that accord with Aalto University’s ambitions for a new kind of academic environment encouraging multi-disciplinary interaction.
URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE

× Rectangular worm-like structure creates interesting spaces with itself and with the environment.
× The building volumes leave a free and open landscape between the new buildings and the former main building, as well as the buildings to the west.
× The general solution offers the possibility of creating future buildings in the open area just west of and opposite to the former main building auditorium, including spaces either for the Arts Building or other future uses.
× The traffic arrangements are simple and clear.
× The view from the tree-lined avenue leading towards the library and the entry to the courtyard of the former main building should not be interrupted but be more open and inviting.
× The urban solution has to be adjusted to achieve a clearer spatial hierarchy in the plan. There should be a more obvious central square, with a clear main entrance to the new Aalto ARTS near the metro station.
× The resulting structure is too homogenous and lacks a clear hierarchy: it is not clear from the documentation what the intended roles of the various elements are.
× The proposal attaches itself to the existing buildings in the west and remains unnecessarily far from Aalto’s former former main building.
× The linden avenue leading from the west to the former main building and library is cut off unnecessarily.

USABILITY

× The thin building volumes provide natural light for all spaces
× The connections from volume to volume seem easy. Departments are separated from each other within the Arts Building complex.
× There is a close connection from the metro to the facilities and to commercial space and an indoor connection from the commercial space to the facilities.
× The inner courtyards are numerous and difficult to maintain. For a large part of the year, their use would be limited because of snow, ice, or other adverse weather conditions.
× Each courtyard element has its own entrance and there are not many common spaces to facilitate spontaneous encounters.
× Covering at least part of the inner courtyards would make the proposal more cost-efficient and functional, while also providing larger collective spaces and indoor lobbies that could be used year-round. Distances inside the buildings would also be shortened as a result.
× Further consideration should be given to simplifying connections between inside and outside and opening up key parts of the buildings in favourable weather conditions.
× Some of the volumes could spread towards the former main building to create a denser urban space. Making the building even taller in some places would also give it an even stronger and more distinct character.
× Narrow rectangular forms result in long, monotonous corridors, long distances between facilities, and (at least in this early phase) rather ordinary floor plans.
× The floor plans are realistic, but dull. They could be developed quite easily into a more functional, interesting, and (cost-)effective series of internal spaces.
× Consideration should be given to including more service facilities within the complex, such as more bars, restaurants, shops, spaces to hang out in, and other places to encourage people to stay in the area.
× A clearer indication should be made of those facilities and activities that are potential attractors, giving careful thought to their strategic location within the whole.
× Is it possible to eliminate the sunken courtyards and have almost all the usable area on or above ground level?
× The gross floor area – **50,000 m²** – is quite close to the competition’s space allocation.
UNIQUENESS

× One of the few proposals to take the genius loci of Otaniemi as the primary starting-point for the design. The form and the facades have a sophisticated feel to them. The vertical volumes and bands of glass give an airiness to the red brick volumes.

× "stay strong sweetie" blends too much into the old Aalto environment. Although strong and rigorous in its ability to control its surroundings, it would benefit from having a stronger character of its own and one that draws on the Aalto palette to offer something more unique. In its current form, the design does not act as a clear enough symbol of revitalization and renewal or create a modern and innovative learning environment within an innovative ecosystem

TRAFFIC

× The principal east-west axis for pedestrian and bicycle traffic passes easily through the park-like campus square.

× The university’s former main building, the library, the new Aalto ARTS Building, and the metro station function well as terminating points for people arriving from different directions.

× Space for drop-off traffic should be allocated at the western entrance to the metro station.

× Parking facilities should be extended to provide the number of spaces specified in the programme.

× Bicycle parking areas should be located close to the entrances to the metro station, the commercial premises, and the Aalto ARTS Building.

× Adequate arrangements should be planned for service access to both the Aalto ARTS Building and the commercial facilities.
ENTRY 075

"HIPSTERKASBAH"

GENERAL
This proposal creates a dense village-like group of buildings, while at the same time giving the impression of a single volume. The aim has been to move future building developments away from an all-embracing homogenous campus style towards a more pluralistic and diverse mixture. The alleys proposed are very narrow and give an intimate, somewhat sympathetic medieval feel to the overall village milieu.

There is a positive feeling and strong enthusiasm present in “HIPSTERKASBAH”. However, at some levels the design displays more enthusiasm than experience, as can be detected in the slipshod internal planning of some of the interior spaces.
URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE

- The new interventions create a very urban feeling. It fits the existing urban structure well and creates interesting, different outdoor spaces. The main plaza is well-proportioned and is well situated in front of the existing main building. The new buildings and the former main building are connected through the plaza.
- The new main axes lead in a natural way towards the former main building and its entrances.
- The area is bisected by a great number of alleyways varying in width and overall length, however: the direction and number of these seem very arbitrary in some cases. More thought needs to be given to reducing the number of these and to studying their routes and relative widths. The library is situated naturally in the middle of a large park.
- The new organisation of the traffic south of the old library is well thought-out.
- The architecture of the blocks adopts a pluralistic approach, which represents a logical strategy in what is in effect a dense urban village. However, the architectural treatment of many of the buildings looks clumsy and excessively ‘commercial’ and needs a re-think. High-quality ‘ordinariness’ is a commendable aim, but needs to be executed very well to be convincing.

USABILITY

- Mixing the space programme (i.e. commercial and academic spaces alternate with each other) could lead to a livelier urban atmosphere in this area, helping alleviate the passive, suburban nature of present-day Otaniemi.
- The human scale of the alleyway network is very attractive but, considering the Finnish climate, these alleyways might not be so enjoyable for users.
- The number of alleyways may even hinder the effective day-to-day work of the Aalto ARTS Building.
- The garage-like nature of many of the workspaces is very appropriate, as this school is very much based on the notion of learning by doing.
- Some of the plans and layouts of the buildings are quite unrealistic and almost arbitrary in some cases.
- The gross floor area proved difficult to estimate from the documentation and needs to be clarified in the next phase. Is it possible to enlarge the overall area or increase the heights of some buildings so that the concept remains the same?
- The building volumes are split into too many small units, with sharp corners that would be difficult to use. Bridges link buildings to each other, but if people do not want to climb to the upper floors, they would be forced to cross a snowy, rainy, windy alley to go from class to class. Insufficient attention has been paid to long-term flexibility, as the plans are too specific in many places: the building typologies need a more generic approach to spatial organization.
Many of the floor plans show basic inconsistencies between floor levels.

With the school housed in so many smaller building units, is there a danger that individual buildings would become enclaves for different disciplines, rather than encouraging cross-disciplinary cooperation? Could the concept be developed to offer a better balance between offering ideal working conditions for developing students’ professional skills and knowledge and creating appropriate places and atmospheres for natural interaction with creative people from other disciplines?

Some of the volumes are very interesting in their irregular shapes.

Many of the building volumes are too small and too sharp to be realistic (there is a large number of unusable triangular-shaped areas).

The school is split into several buildings, but departments are not separated from each other as entities. Some rooftops are used, which is good.

The metro station is in a separate building according to existing metro plans but would be easy to incorporate within the proposal. The facades of the buildings are quite generic and would need further study to become convincing.

Some views and the internal atmosphere look promising.

The principal east-west axis for pedestrian and bicycle traffic passes easily through the park-like campus square.

The university’s main building, the library, the new Arts Building, and the metro station function well as terminating points for people arriving from different directions.

There are several interesting routes through the centre of the campus.

The entrances to the parking facilities are readily accessible and do not present any problems for the urban landscape.

Space for drop-off traffic should be provided at the western entrance to the metro station.

Bicycle parking should be provided in the vicinity of services at the western edge of the area. Adequate arrangements should be planned for service access to commercial facilities.
ENTRY 125
"492700"

GENERAL
A beautifully and convincingly developed scheme, with a strong concept, rugged, and inspiring in its use potential, yet sensitive to change. The concept is the embodiment of the notion that an inspiring building should be like an instrument that can be played in a multitude of ways by its users.

The idea of solving the spatial emptiness of the current landscape with one major new building has been carried through with courage and professional panache. Although further work is still needed to reduce some of the overlarge external spaces, the architects have managed to offer a healthy and enthusiastic fusion of academia as an on-going multi-levelled workshop, a factory for the intellect, and a stimulating place to encourage artistic and scientific activity, in groups or alone. The main weakness of the project is the lack of spatial determinacy in the external areas, which appear to continue the random and shapeless nature of much of the present campus.
The proposal offers a careful balance between producing a workable and stimulating learning environment in a compact and understandable form while allowing the different edges of the building to have a dialogue with their immediate neighbours.

Despite forming a large and deep-plan building, the result is sensitively scaled to sit comfortably with the older buildings, although the vague architectural treatment is more reminiscent of high-quality factories than the more conventional redbrick idiom of the original campus. This contrast provides a welcome contrast to the somewhat repetitive and dull re-workings of Aalto’s original brick design language that litter Otaniemi today.

However, the designers have failed to highlight the possible architectural outcome of their thinking, and this needs further development.

The building volume is likely to grow, as the design is currently under-sized; particular attention should be paid to ensuring that the resulting volume will still fit harmoniously in its context.

The vaguely presented façade treatment is very self-effacing and anonymous in character. The bland and somewhat over-utilitarian nature of the building needs further study. The new building does leave enough space around the former main building and the main library, all the same.

However, there is still a need to refine and possibly reshape the external spaces: the large park-like area to the north of the main building does not offer any clear gathering places for larger events and is too amorphous in size, shape, and atmosphere to suggest or encourage a place for significant events or gatherings. In its present state, the design is too reminiscent of Alvarinaukio, the main landscaped space south of the original main building.

The idea of creating sheltered outdoor spaces at ground floor level, opening on to the surrounding squares, would be one way of giving the project a more intimate scale and is worth developing further.

Consideration should be given to creating a clearer and more distinct arrival ‘square’ between the former main building, the library, and the new Aalto ARTS Building, while at the same time giving some thought to amending and improving the building edge north of the new building, especially in terms of scale.

The ground floor needs further development: consideration should be given to making the entrance and foyer areas more attractive to outsiders as well as the building’s users.

The area west of the main library also needs strengthening spatially, although the idea of locating a new building (including commercial space and restaurants) under a landscaped tilted roof is an interesting and commendable starting-point.
USABILITY
× The proposal is one of the few attempts in the competition to conceptualise the learning facilities of the new building in a thought-provoking, stimulating, and provocative way. Using the metaphor of the ancient Greek democratic grid city, a generic spatial order has been created that allows for active hubs to form at any number of intersections. Combined with spatial connections between floors and the provision of well-sited atrium gardens and yards, a matrix of spatial possibilities has been offered using the simplest of physical means.
× Sheltered external spaces at ground level have been included to expand the potential use of the entire site. These spaces and how they could be used need further study, as they are rather dull and unattractive in their present form.
× There is a question whether the interior spaces are well enough lit with daylight. Attention needs to be given to looking at how more natural light could penetrate the interior spaces.
× Placing all parking below the new building results in an excessively ‘heavy’ structure.
× The building is also undersized by almost 25%; consideration will need to be given to expanding the building towards and maybe even including the metro station entrance. This would also improve communications between the buildings.

UNIQUENESS
× The variety of spatial offerings is one of the most comprehensive and convincing of the competition. If developed further, it could result in a unique and memorable addition to the campus, setting new standards, and opening up new opportunities for academic innovation and progress.

TRAFFIC
× The principal east-west axis for pedestrian and bicycle traffic passes easily through the park-like campus square.
× The university’s main building, the library, the new Aalto ARTS Building, and the metro station function well as terminating points for people arriving from different directions.
× Service access to the Aalto ARTS Building is arranged in a functional manner at ground level, whilst service access to the grocery shop is underground, where the actual shop is located.
× Parking spaces for bicycles should be arranged in the vicinity of both entrances to the metro station and the grocery shop. Arrangements related to the underground commercial premises and their service access must be presented. Vehicular access to the parking facilities must also be provided on the eastern side of the site.
GENERAL
The proposal has taken the building blocks of the former main building, shaken them up, and spread them out on the square to form a dense urban village. The scale and material of the blocks follows the old Otaniemi logic, but the way in which they have been arranged is new and fresh. The approach has a lot to commend it; a large building volume has been organised into a collection of smaller, but effectively linked volumes, creating the potential for realising a more human, sympathetic, and attractive educational environment. The spatial organisational idea is based on employing a variable rhombic structure, reminiscent of the DNA helix. This simple, but flexible system is capable of producing a wide range and variety of spatial configurations. In this case, it has led to some awkwardness, confusion, and lack of clarity in some of the internal spatial arrangements, and resulted in areas without sufficient daylight. These issues will need to be addressed convincingly in the next development stage.

URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE
× The proposal takes the former main building and the library and the views towards these structures into consideration effectively.
× The links between the metro station and the existing buildings to the north are free and good.
× The open outdoor spaces are too large in places and the arrangement of the blocks follows the underlying logic too simplistically. By breaking this logic a little and perhaps reaching towards the Puumies (Nano) building, the arrangement would be more relaxed and the outdoor spaces would improve.
× The main plaza seems successful in scale and incorporates the library in a pleasant way.
× The new volumes, with their gables, facing the former main building, are scaled well and create a vivid dialogue with Aalto’s buildings.
USABILITY
- The floor plans are arranged around diamond-shaped central spaces that offer large workshops in some areas, high lobbies in others, and sometimes combine smaller spaces and access to the lower floors.
- Study and work areas are rationally arranged around these diamond-shaped spaces.
- Departments have been marked as separate parts of the building, but this is mainly just semantics. In fact, they are all well-connected and part of the same entity.
- The connections in the building, although spatially interesting, need some clarification and simplification.
- There are many common spaces to facilitate spontaneous encounters. The variation of height in the spaces is interesting. The gross floor area – approx. 54,000 m² – is quite close to the competition requirement.
- The spatial organization within the building is not as clear as it need to be.
- Thought should be given to breaking or varying the dogmatic geometric tyranny of the matrix by carefully manipulating its component parts.
- The edges of the complex, in particular, need attention.
- Routes through and around the building need further study and refinement.
- The repetition of the diamond matrix has led to situations in which users might find difficulties in orientation.
- The narrow, sharp-edged courtyards result in many locations with insufficient views or daylight internally.
- The mixture of public and commercial functions with university spaces near the metro station is good.

UNIQUENESS
- The variation in height, material, and orientation of the blocks gives the facades an interesting appearance.
- Playing with large areas of red brick and glass gives the brick a new airiness while still tying the building to its surroundings.
- The architectural treatment has great potential and the resemblance to a small dense urban village has been presented very convincingly and attractively.

TRAFFIC
- The principal east-west axis for pedestrian and bicycle traffic passes easily through the park-like campus square.
- The university’s main building, the library, the new Aalto ARTS Building, and the metro station function well as terminating points for people arriving from different directions.
- Bicycle parking is located effectively in the vicinity of the entrance areas to the metro station, commercial services, and the new Arts Building.
- Well-functioning spaces for drop-off traffic to the metro station and the Aalto ARTS Building are provided next to the parking facility.
- Functional service access arrangements for the Aalto ARTS Building and commercial premises have been provided at ground level.
- The traffic arrangements presented in the proposal do not require any changes.
ENTRY 135
"AINOA"

GENERAL
An unusual and consciously provocative scheme, blending both architectural and landscape elements to create one of the competition’s most memorable and inspiring squares in relationship to Aalto’s original main building. Although the project is still at an embryonic stage, the core concept envisages a kind of deep-plan ‘Arts Factory’ covered with a series of modulating and articulated roofs to create a new and intriguing social landscape for this important junction at Otaniemi. Despite the sketchy nature of the proposal, it contains sufficient ideas for developing into a very unique and engaging entity. The concept and architectural potential are so unique, powerful, and intriguing that the scheme deserves the chance to be developed during the second stage.
URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE

× The new building enfolds and shapes the current large plaza in an exemplary fashion, responding to and addressing each existing neighbouring structure and landscape feature in a positive manner.

× The shape of the main arrival square has been handled particularly well. In its present state, it is still somewhat large, but the idea is flexible and strong enough to accommodate a further refinement of this major urban space.

× The new central square could be slightly tightened up, especially in front of the library.

× Although the organization of the building divides the space roughly into two, the ground-level linking section has been given a strong role in the overall composition, forming both a strong internal spatial connection as well as a convincing entry point and interesting outdoor gathering area.

× The view from the west towards the former main building is framed in an interesting way.

× However, both the visual and the communication link from the west towards the main building should definitely be improved and made clearer.

× Extensive roof access is suggested, and this idea would need further clarification, especially access points, the pitch of the sloping surfaces, provision of railings, spaces to stop and linger, general ease of maintenance, and the nature of the roof lights needed for such a building. The location of the outside auditorium is particularly interesting at the main junction between the two main masses.

× The images form a memorable calling card for the entire Aalto adventure.

× The car ramp in front of the library is too dominant.

USABILITY

× The application of a factory-like spatial organization for the diverse activities of the Aalto ARTS Building seems an appropriate starting-point, but in its present sketchy state needs further development.

× Reliance on a continuous glazed external wall needs further study, both from a climatic as well as economic standpoint.

× The technical demands of the roof structure need clarification. Is it necessary, for example, to provide unlimited access to every part of the roofscape?

× Further attention should be given to developing a simpler hierarchy of fixed and adaptable elements within the building volume to improve people’s orientation.

× The gross floor area – approx. 71,000 m² – exceeds the competition’s space allocation and should be radically reduced in the next stage.

× The size of the building could be reduced relatively easily, which would also improve the potential for introducing more natural light into the deep-plan structure.

× Much more daylight needs to be brought into the inner depths of the building.

× The issue of providing adequate daylight into such a deep-plan series of spaces needs special attention, as it appears to be totally insufficient in the current design. This is the fundamental question mark in this proposal, and calls for creative development and rethinking.
UNIQUENESS

× The overall solution, although sketchy, promises to make a distinct contribution to the Otaniemi campus. To some extent, it recalls a couple of new university additions in Delft and Singapore (i.e. grass roofs and curving window walls), but the internal spatial concept is more unique, radical, and inspiring.

× The conceptual thinking recalls Riken Yamamoto’s impressive University of the Future in Hakodate, Hokkaido, Gehry’s recent ideas for the Google organization headquarters, or even some of the pioneering buildings for large organisations developed in Holland by Herman Hertzberger.

× Current, cutting-edge sustainable technical solutions can be easily and seamlessly integrated to form a true micro eco-system for the whole complex.

TRAFFIC

× The principal access for pedestrian and bicycle traffic from the west to the campus square passes via the first floor of the new building.

× The upward ramps are too steep for both pedestrians and cyclists.

× The upward slope also cuts off the view from the west towards the main building.

× The library, the Arts Building, and the metro station act as effective terminating points for people coming from other directions.

× Service access is provided in a functional manner from the north and south sides of the new building at street level.

× The shape of the parking facilities is unclear.

× The pedestrian and bicycle routes leading from the west to the campus square should be developed to meet the accessibility requirements and ensure that the main building is more clearly visible as the terminating point of the axis.

× Space for drop-off traffic should be allocated at the western entrance to the metro station. Relocating the parking facilities from the building’s basement level to beneath the square may result in a more functional and less expensive solution.
ENTRY 176
"NOLLI"

GENERAL
“NOLLI” divides the space into three masses that are confidently and effectively placed around the main plaza close to the existing buildings. The architecture of the new buildings has been kept deliberately neutral in relationship to the older main building.

The plans are organized along a comb-like layout. An interior street starts from the integrated metro station hall and divides the biggest building at ground level. The design demonstrates a high level of professionalism and experience, and has been convincingly presented.
URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE
× The three volumes sit in their surroundings well. The relation of the new buildings and outdoor spaces to Aalto’s buildings is very good from an urban perspective.
× The size of the main plaza is somewhat exaggerated. The link from the west is good, but the monumental axis leading from the T-house to the former main building is ‘stiff’. The shapes of the masses complement their positioning.
× Nice, pocket-like outdoor spaces have been created on all sides of the buildings.
× The structure of the three separate buildings is unnecessarily repetitive.
× The roof shapes are interesting, although technically very demanding.
× The facades of the building are quite promising, sympathetic in scale, and fresh, but rather schematic. The high glass walls and wooden vertical elements are promising, although not particularly unique.
× On the other hand, they seem unfinished and do not mesh with the roofs. Greater harmonization between these different elements should be considered.

USABILITY
× The school’s departments are located in different buildings, which is far from ideal.
× The spaces could be divided along different lines than simple departmental ones.
× The space ship-like roofs would need considerable rethinking to introduce an adequate amount of daylight into the interiors.
× The floor plans are rational and flexible. Some corridors are long, monotonous, and boring, and the light shafts and volumes are too repetitive.
× Consideration should be given to introducing greater variety to the floor plans by replacing some light shafts with inner courtyards and modifying the sizes of the volumes under the roof.
× Although natural light is provided to all spaces through light shafts, is it sufficient?
× Are the plans too rational to be cozy and interesting?
× The floor area – approx. 52,000 m² – is very realistic.

TRAFFIC
× The principal east-west axis for pedestrian and bicycle traffic passes easily through the park-like campus square.
× The university’s main building, the library, the new Arts Building, and the metro station function well as terminating points for people arriving from different directions.
× A functional, high-quality solution has been presented for parking bicycles at the metro station.
× Space for drop-off traffic shall be allocated at the western entrance to the metro station. Service access to commercial premises should be arranged so as to prevent service traffic from using the campus square.
× Bicycle parking space should also be allocated for university use in outdoor areas and in the vicinity of the commercial premises at the north end of the new building.
Phase 1 Individual Evaluation

UPPER CLASS ENTRIES
The selection of a series of entries to an upper class

The Competition Jury has decided to select some entries for inclusion in an upper class. The selection has been based primarily on how well they meet the general assessment criteria set in the competition programme.

Additional weight has been given to the following aspects:
× High professional quality, in respect of both the uniqueness and feasibility of the design.
× Ideas with potential for further development in the urban and landscape layout of the project. There are several projects worthy of mention here, with some basic ideas similar to the entries selected for Phase 2.
× Individual and innovative ideas and solutions for the study and working environment, studios, and meeting areas.
× Ideas for creating an interesting and balanced dialogue between the new building(s) and the existing environment.

The rest of the entries have not been divided into any other classes. All entries received an individual review as part of the judging process.

ENTRY 009
”CONNECTING PEOPLE”

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The low-lying building mass distributes the space over a very large area, which makes space utilization ineffective. The view towards the Alvar Aalto Central Square is constricted.

USABILITY
Numerous entrances are difficult to control. The interior forms an impersonal labyrinth, in which people would find it difficult to orientate themselves.

GENERAL
An interesting proposal in which the spatial programme is located in a low, green-roofed building. Problems are caused by the connections and the views from the west towards the campus area.

UNIQUENESS
The park located on the roof is an interesting idea, but difficult to realize. The repetition of similar architectural elements throughout the new buildings seems somewhat monotonous.
ENTRY 014
"ORGANIC"

GENERAL
The proposal has a very clear concept: a covered street and a large roof links three wedge-shaped buildings. One of the buildings has a large interior courtyard. The building complex is covered with an undulating green roof. A new clearly defined central square lies between the old Aalto former main building and the new Arts Building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE
A green roof and wooden structures are new in Otaniemi. The undulating green roof is an interesting element. The scale and the concept of the new building are reminiscent of an exhibition centre or an airport terminal and are excessively large for the environment. Unfortunately, greenery is not visible at street level or in the building.

USABILITY
The proposal has a very clear concept and development potential. The covered street connects the different sections effectively and concentrates services and people close to the metro station. The large frame depth in the new building could result in dark and unpleasant interiors in many parts of the building. There is a lack of comfort and cosiness. The entry needs areas where people can sit and concentrate on their studies. The floor plans need to be developed to be more realistic, functional, and effective.

The extensive use of wooden structures in such a large public building creates additional fire, technical, and structural challenges, as well as high costs.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal provides a clear contrast to the prevailing red-brick character of the existing Otaniemi. The extensive use of wooden structures could be ecologically justified.
ENTRY 019
"SAVOY CENTRAL SQUARE"

GENERAL
The new additions have been treated as a series of separate but related buildings, which reduces the size of the existing large plaza. The approach is commendable and has potential. Unfortunately, the designer has undermined a promising composition by introducing a landscape motif based on the form of the famous Savoy vase, a rather banal, forced, and artificial gesture. The elements defining this square seem out of place in this context and recall pergola and veranda devices more familiar from a beach hotel milieu on the Riviera.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Despite a strong attempt to create a new landscape element, the solution seems too alien and separate from the existing context, forming little, if any, clear connection with the former main building or the main access points of the new structures.

USABILITY
Internal spatial planning is competent, but lacks a clear elemental hierarchy; each building seems to offer a similar strategy without indicating which parts are more important than others.

UNIQUENESS
The building elements are well considered and their relative size and scale fit comfortably with the existing university buildings. It is questionable, however, whether a large number of physically separate volumes would offer a sufficiently strong and clear framework for the activities of the new ARTS School. Architecturally, the approach is too cautious.
ENTRY 024
"The Butterfly Effect"

GENERAL
The proposal consists of a single large building with some high elevations, covering a large part of the available site. By lowering the mass in the middle, the visual axis towards the former main building’s dominant auditorium has been maintained, but this has resulted in a very high western end to the building, which is at odds with the existing buildings. With its glass facades, "The Butterfly Effect" is ethereal and delicate. The entry is very skilfully executed and elegant in terms of its architectural composition.

URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE
The views towards the former main building and library have been carefully taken into consideration. "The Butterfly Effect" creates a solid connection to the T-building, which feels quite isolated in the current urban situation. There is a pedestrian connection through the building, which is important. The main library does not, however, have a clear role within the new plaza. On the other hand, it stands in the middle of a large park, which seems a natural solution. The high volumes at the edges of the new buildings might intrude on the traditional ‘iconic’ view westwards towards the old Alvarinaukio campus field. The facades and roof lines need a firmer, clearer, and more realistic approach.

USABILITY
The main lobby of the building seems an exciting, airy, and inspiring place in which to study and meet people, combining the majesty of a Greek temple with the lightness and grace of contemporary architecture (e.g. Sanaa).

The other indoor arrangements seem well thought-out and flexible. There is no dogmatic division between departments, which offers a high level of flexibility and adaptability. The use of the rooftops and breaking the mass into smaller cube-like volumes is a clever idea and brings more natural light into the interior and creates intimate outdoor spaces as a natural spatial continuation to the adjoining indoor spaces.

The rooftops are horizontal and there are several connections onto the roof, which forms a usable space. The main lobby is too high and large to be realistic and cost effective; the height could be reduced without taking anything away from the
overall idea or atmosphere. There is also an over-abundance of double or triple-height spaces that does not always seem justified from a functional or economic perspective.

The interior views seem excessively bright and ethereal. Too much glass and not enough contrast of light and shade. The interiors would probably suffer from excess light, resulting in a disturbing level of glare in places. To use this amount of roof as outdoor spaces is questionable, both technically and in terms of usability in the prevailing climate.

A separate metro building is not ideal, but situating the bike parking and car parking in/under the metro station/commercial facilities is intelligent.

Overall, the entry is very professionally executed.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal provides a clear contrast to the present dominance of red-brick in Otaniemi. The overall scale of the building is too large for the existing environment, however.
ENTRY 025
"the ReCharged Void"

GENERAL
"the ReCharged Void" is more like a city plan than a series of well-functioning buildings. The ground plan is very effective and promising, but the buildings are not so well thought-out or even realistic. The treatment of the façades is clumsy and looks cheap and banal, more reminiscent of a shopping mall or outlet centre than a university.

URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE
"the ReCharged Void" has a very strong urban feel: the volumes seem natural in size and sit well, both with each other and in relation to the existing environment. The ground plan integrates and completes both the Puumies (Nano) block and the VTT block; the distances to the existing buildings are respectful but spatially intense. The views towards the former main building and the library are carefully considered. The library is part of the entity and the several plazas that the volumes effortlessly create are well-placed and natural in scale. Green areas are in balance with the paved areas. Pedestrian and biking connections are excellent.

The shapes of the buildings are natural, but playful. The cantilevered sections of the buildings add variety to the volumes. Some parts of the building could be more varied in height to provide more character and a more interesting townscape. The metro station is shown according to the existing plans, and could easily be integrated into the new building complex.

USABILITY
The inner courtyards bring natural light into the spaces. Departments are separated in their own buildings with a connecting indoor bridge. Lume has been situated between the departments, which separates them even more, however. The commercial facilities are placed in a separate building close to the metro station, which seems natural. On the other hand, the restaurants and cafes have been placed in the same separate building, which does not make sense.

The plans and layouts of the buildings are very poor and almost arbitrary. The solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way. Teaching areas seem dull and monotonous and there are some fairly long corridors. On the other hand, the way the corridors organically shift into lobbies and back to corridors is well-handled.

The designers seem to have a good feel for city planning, but lack experience in building design.

UNIQUENESS
the ReCharged Void" is one of the very few attempts to turn Otaniemi into a clearly urban or city-like environment. The ground plan is very promising and creates numerous urban plazas and outdoor areas with a human scale and atmosphere. The facades are not successful, however. It seems as if the designer ran out of time and wanted to present some sort of translucent, neutral material. The character of the architecture definitely needs to be addressed further.
ENTRY 037
"ARTery"

GENERAL
A fascinating and philosophically stimulating entry that creates a leaf-like cluster of independent but interconnected departments; half of the required volume is above ground with the rest below.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal makes no attempt to adjust to any of the existing coordinates but creates its own DNA for the site. The result is an interesting series of external spaces. Despite the adherence to a scale in sympathy with the existing milieu, the architectural treatment is too bland and anonymous in its current form and needs further study.

USABILITY
The planning is professional and rigorous, ensuring a balance between each department’s separate identity and the need for a collective ‘playground’ for collaborative endeavours. However, the overall distances between some of the facilities are excessive.

UNIQUENESS
A distinct and thought-provoking proposal that would need a radically more compact approach to make it workable for ART’s activities.

ENTRY 052
"AVE AALTO ARTIFICS TE SALUTANT"

GENERAL
A well-researched design based on the landscape of the broader environment. In addition to the Arts Building, auxiliary buildings are positioned southwest of the old library and north of Otaniementie (Lume etc.).

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The positioning and the scale of the buildings are in balance with the environment. Frontal squares of agreeable size are formed in the foreground of the former main building and the library. The principal views towards the Alvar Aalto buildings have been taken into account very well.

USABILITY
The division of the space into smaller units and the use of interconnecting galleries are sound starting-points.

UNIQUENESS
The design is a carefully considered whole, yet remains somehow fragmentary in terms of its overall architectural style. The streamlined facades next to the former main building appear out of place.
GENERAL
A design reflecting great care and professionalism. The principal requirements of the competition programme have been very clearly fulfilled. The result, however, is a very large, machine-like building characterised by a repetition of similar units. It is doubtful whether this would create an inspiring working and learning environment.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The building is centred very efficiently on the southwest side of Otaniemietie. This is a good starting-point. The principal views towards the former main building remain open, and sufficient space is left around the group of former main buildings. The central idea of this design is the creation of a new, triangularly shaped lowered square west of the former main building, which prevents the vertical dimensions of the large group of buildings from eclipsing the Alvar Aalto buildings. The new facilities are located on the other sides of the lowered square under terraces. This feels artificial in relation to the surrounding terrain and landscape, however. Access to the old buildings is also complicated, as these are on a high terrace in relation to the square. While the old buildings are treated respectfully in a sense, they are also slightly isolated from the new square. Access to the new metro station also seems complicated.

USABILITY
The positioning of the buildings is characterised by an aim to achieve maximum efficiency, but it remains questionable whether the repetition of similar units is flexible enough for future architectural changes. Access routes to the old buildings and the new metro station are complicated, although those to the new building are relatively direct.

UNIQUENESS
The design presents, in its own way, a very clear-cut model for the buildings. Its institutional character, however, evokes the rationalist office and university centres of past decades instead of a modern university campus that facilitates the integration of working and learning environments and supports urban interaction.
ENTRY 063
"BIRCH AND BRICK CELEBRATION"

GENERAL
A promising and deceptively simple and strong concept that introduces a new and innovative place to Otaniemi, reinterpreting the brick and woodland traditions in a dynamic and inspiring way.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The combination of birch trunks and bearing columns forms a consistent and powerful spatial organising motif, creating an interesting new plaza for the former main building, as well as a woodland clearing and arrival point.

USABILITY
A new social landscape is offered by six separate buildings tightly dispersed within the birch trees. The idea for the Lume facilities forming a semi-submerged spatial volume fits well with the overall concept.

UNIQUENESS
A memorable offering and beautifully articulated, but essentially theoretical. The designers would need to study the challenges that winter represents before the idea could be completely convincing.

ENTRY 069
"MAAD"

GENERAL
The proposal is based on a composition of two statuesque pieces that are very dominant in relation to Aalto’s former main building. The proposal is well thought-out in urban terms, as the traffic arrangements are simple and clear.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new buildings leave sufficient space around the former main building and the library, and their architecture is unprejudiced and skilfully presented. The buildings are of a high standard and interesting, but their relationship to Alvar Aalto’s environment is problematic.

USABILITY
The plan is presented with precision and professionalism. The interiors are unsurprising, and there are a lot of vertical connections, which reduces the proposal’s cost-efficiency.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal is original and consistent, but its adaptation to the Otaniemi campus area is not fully convincing.
GENERAL
A beautifully and clearly presented proposal, which splits the space into a fragmented whole, giving each of the new ARTS departments its own interconnected sunken courtyard, with studio spaces below ground lit by natural daylight. As a result, the resulting landscape is punctuated by only a few 3-4 storey separate buildings, leaving the bulk of the ground free.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The move to create a new kind of architecture-landscape hybrid environment is commendable and recalls Rike Yamamoto’s successful Saitami Prefectural University near Tokyo and other designs. However, the underground spatial links between departments are not so attractive. The architecture is suitably abstract and minimalist for the strong landscape idea, but the spaces between the visible building masses are too similar and lack hierarchical clarity.

USABILITY
The end-result, although poetically conceived, does not lend itself to providing an academic environment encouraging interaction between departments and different creative disciplines.

UNIQUENESS
The model represents a refreshing reinterpretation of the traditional collegial courtyard model. Climatically, the use of courtyards would be difficult for a large part of the year, however. This aspect calls for further study.
ENTRY 100

"ForestPlaza"

GENERAL
The proposal is interesting and well thought-out from the urban structural standpoint. The new structure complements the existing ones. Together with the former main building, it defines the key-shaped space as a large forested opening, hence the name. The idea has potential and is one of the most interesting in the competition in terms of cityscape.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new structure located opposite the library is a successful addition to the urban structure, but the Arts Building is not completely convincing and its forms seem somewhat haphazard in places.

USABILITY
The rooftscape is interesting, but the layout of the building is rather schematic. The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.

UNIQUENESS
While the general plan is very interesting, the design of the Arts Building plan itself does not rise to the same level.
GENERAL
An intriguing entry, which is relaxed and almost playful in its relationship with the existing fabric of the campus. The proposal’s main virtue lies in the creation of a low, but well-scaled intervention, creating a pleasant but rather passive dialogue with the older buildings of the university. The pavilion-like nature of the composition allows for a very flexible implementation of the actual building process, if needed.

In their present form, the disposition and internals of the spatial arrangements are not particularly innovative or inspiring. However, they do have the merit of being easily transformable and adaptive, which is important as university organizations tend to change over time.

URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE
A street-like tapering space leading to the former main building has been created between the new Arts Building and the long service buildings. This allows good contact, both visually and practically, between the old and new parts of the central campus. The square itself, however, seems excessively large, but could easily be articulated or landscaped with more greenery.

The square, in the form of an articulated triangle, picks up the four main entry points, from the eastern, northern, southern, and western approaches to the area, as well as emphasizing a clear link to the new metro station. The scale of this main urban space is well-modulated by the three-storey structures and their accompanying overhanging roofs and single-storey arcade spaces. Commercial space has been placed opposite the main library. The architecture of these new interventions is extremely discrete. The relationship of the new to the old is respectful, rather than provocative.

The paved area between the buildings is too large and open to create dynamic urban contacts in this central area. The architectural quality of the complex and the message contained within operates at a low-key level, almost as though the buildings are accompanying the solo part played by the landmark old auditorium. Humility is a noble quality, but has not resulted here in the kind of inspiring environments that Aalto University aspires to.

The architecture is perhaps too bland and anonymous to be seen as a vivid addition to the present campus, reflecting an atmosphere more akin to a business park. Sufficient attention has not been paid to providing the kind of stimulating conditions that would help the university become a vibrant and appealing intellectual centre for the community.

USABILITY
The treatment of the roofs and arcades has strong potential and would enable people to move comfortably between the buildings and around the
urban space in all weather conditions. The idea could benefit from the development of a strong spatial linking sequence below ground, between the two separate complexes.

While demonstrating a high level of professionalism, the proposal is plagued by a lack of surprises, as well as a certain dullness. The learning environment needs stimulants and spatial surprises, the same repetitive themes and long corridor spaces are not particularly inspiring. The authors need to rethink how the threshold between departments can be lowered. The spatial organization of the interior spaces needs to be reworked to create the potential for more interactive collaboration at both staff and student level. The present arrangement is too ‘railway carriage-like’ to form natural links between adjoining disciplines.

A clearer distinction needs to be made between spaces that can be used for a variety of joint functions and larger gatherings, the so-called shopfloor or workshop areas, and those that encourage quiet concentration and individual focused activity. The present location of the commercial facilities below ground is entirely unacceptable and would make them difficult to find, both from the metro station as well as by passers-by.

The parking areas are located under the large urban concourse, together with some of the departmental spaces. Some teaching space is also located below ground, adjacent to the parking facility. Although attention has been paid to directing daylight into some of these spaces, the solution is still unacceptable and needs a radical rethink to ensure that adequate light reaches all working spaces.

**UNIQUENESS**

The architecture of the complex, although very professionally developed, is devoid of character and charm. The architectural effect is more akin to that of a business park aesthetic than that of a global university aspiring to become a major pioneer in the fields of artistic and scientific research.

The role of the new buildings is seen very much as supporting and emphasizing the former main building of the campus. Although the proposal demonstrates a high level of professional skill, the result leaves major doubts as to the design’s potential for being developed into a more interesting set of interior arrangements for the new school, as well as a more personable architectural treatment.
GENERAL
In this design, the new buildings, with the exception of the metro station, are grouped into a single, unbroken entity of diverse detail southwest of Otaniemietie. The rest of the exterior space has been left as green area.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The solution is straightforward and uncomplicated: a focused group of buildings and a very spacious green area. The views towards the former main building and the library are unobstructed. The scale of the new buildings is in harmony with the old ones. The jagged brick facades and gables engage in dialogue with the Alvar Aalto buildings. The driveway/ramp directly in front of the old library, however, mars the proposed green area.

USABILITY
The deployment of different functions appears natural. The building can be built in stages, and its different elements allow for flexible variation. Some of the narrow courtyards left between the wing sections become light wells and do not provide any interesting interior views.

UNIQUENESS
A well-researched and consistently executed design. The decision to use a very focused group of new buildings balanced out with a spacious planted campus landscape is implemented very coherently. The final architectural touch is perhaps missing, however, both from the buildings and from the way that the landscape has been designed. The relatively compact group of buildings evokes the new university centres of past decades, but does not necessarily give the promise of an inspiring and creative learning environment.
GENERAL
A thoroughly researched and presented design that highlights the landscape values of the area successfully. In terms of overall architectural expression, however, the design lacks a certain finishing touch.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The designer has carefully researched not only the immediate surroundings of the new buildings but the entire landscape around the area. The result is a design that takes the existing buildings into account very successfully, especially the former main building and the library buildings designed by Alvar Aalto, their foreground, and the views towards the buildings.

In addition to the actual Arts Building, the design highlights suitable positions for additional buildings to frame the exterior spaces in the area southwest of the old library and north of the old main auditorium. The proposed brick facades of the new buildings interact successfully with the old buildings. The scale of the Arts Building is appropriate. The roofs of the stepped group of buildings form terraces, and the plan suggests these could be implemented as green roofs.

The open landscape between the buildings has been treated as hilly terrain – perhaps a little artificially in this cultural landscape. The numerous light pavilion structures and sitting areas in the campus garden are an idea worthy of further consideration, but they are given too dominant a position and their consistently round shapes appear mannerist. This is, of course, only incidental to the overall design.

USABILITY
The arrangement of the building in the design is thoroughly researched and appears both feasible and functional. The new Arts Building provides opportunities for flexible variations and can easily be implemented in stages. It is, however, questionable whether dividing different services between different buildings that are far apart from each other is a particularly functional solution. Although the shared interior space of the Arts Building provides an area for people to interact, the shape of the space is perhaps too restless, due to the various protrusions projecting into it.

UNIQUENESS
The most notable personal touches of this design are how well it adapts to and develops the surrounding landscape. This perhaps relies a little too heavily on the use of green roofs, however. The overall appearance of the buildings is too unassertive. The different pavilion-like themes used in the park area are unnecessarily exaggerated. The design, however, is a good response to questions posed in the competition assignment.
Although the major outdoor space between the two buildings of the ARTS faculty is excessively large, it has been mainly treated as a new park space, culminating in a smaller and more conventional hard-landscaped area immediately in front of the main entrance to the university’s central building.

The treatment of the landscape, admirably illustrated in the perspective views, is one of the chief merits of this entry. The long straight building volumes facing the open area are very stiff. The Mensa building in particular is schematic and turns its back on the existing buildings west of the former main building, creating a narrow undefined space in between. The pedestrian bridge leading from the new Mensa building towards the former main building abuts the old façade in a questionable way.

The commercial facilities are sited opposite the library, adjacent to the new metro station. The form of the building echoes the architectural motif of Aalto’s earlier small row of shops close by.

The main facade treatment, with its ultra-narrow columns, is somewhat trivial. The overall architectural treatment is very discreet and laid-back, reminiscent of the restful and unhurried atmosphere typical of the more traditional academic values to be found in many of the world’s older and more revered universities. This approach has led to a high quality and sense of timelessness in the immediate environment. The main external spaces should be reduced in size by increasing the general volume of the new adjoining buildings. This, in turn, would provide more possibilities for improving the general spatial arrangements within the Arts Building.
USABILITY
The authors have not strengthened their case by splitting the new building into two separate units with weak connections. The high arcade treatment would not provide adequate protection in adverse weather and seems to be more of a cosmetic addition. The rather conventional use of a central corridor arrangement will not achieve the kind of desired interaction potential, but this can be easily altered by the use of more extensive open ‘workshop’ areas, with fewer smaller closed spaces for focused work activities. The centrally placed lecture hall/stairway units have great potential, as has been demonstrated in the new architectural department of Delft University, but the idea is repeated too often.

The key functional problem is the division of the space into three separate buildings with weak or non-existent internal connections. In winter especially, it would be desirable to provide a good internal connection to the restaurant areas. Strong consideration should be given to a more dynamic reorganization of the internal spaces. Although great economy has been achieved with the tightness of the overall planning, this has resulted in a generally dull and lacklustre internal atmosphere and might severely limit the usability of the floor levels. The authors need to rethink how the threshold between departments could be lowered. The spatial organization of the interior spaces needs to be reworked to create the potential for more interactive collaboration at both staff and student level.

The idea of underlining the ‘learning by doing’ philosophy of many of the school’s departments would be severely compromised by the present layout. Better underground links should be introduced between the new buildings. The entrance to the metro station could be integrated with the Aalto ARTS Building.

UNIQUENESS
The references to the original architecture of the campus have not resulted in a particularly inspired or inventive reinterpretation of Aalto’s original architectural themes and could even be considered as somewhat irritatingly neutral – a weak copy of a strong original, which is close but not close enough.

The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way. The timeless quality and atmospheric effect, shown so convincingly in the perspectives, would be weakened in winter, as the handsome deciduous tree avenues would no longer be in full leaf. While demonstrating a high level of professionalism, the proposal is plagued by a lack of surprises, as well as a certain dullness.
GENERAL
A stylish and beautifully presented variation of a deep-framed solution that manages to offer some new interpretations of Otaniemi’s redbrick assembly.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The suggested infilling of some of the surrounding areas have been carried out sensitively. The varied massing of the main building has an attractive scale to it but, as with all curved forms, the end-result of the largest volume might appear too large for its context.

USABILITY
The spatial planning, although sketchy, looks promising. The roof light solution over the deep-plan areas might prove challenging to maintain in winter. Although containing some interesting architectural ideas, the separate volumes above the one-storey main mass do not quite form a convincing architectural unity.

ENTRY 120
"AUC"
ENTRY 121
”0073”

GENERAL
A strong, memorable, and convincingly presented entry based on forming a large new artificial landscape element in the centre of the site containing a large part of space required. The new low hillock forms a beautifully articulated circular green as the main centrepiece of the composition, complete with water feature. The emphasis on sustainable activities and solutions is communicated well and forms a natural continuation of the basic concept.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The landscape/architecture sits comfortably in the existing milieu and connects the area to the shoreline of the nearby bay, one of the rare entries that has understood the underused potential offered by the proximity of the sea. The monumentality of the architecture of the main campus building is now complimented by this grandiose landscape architecture gesture. The above-ground building masses sit naturally in the overall composition.

USABILITY
The functional workings of the internal space and its suitability as a new creative centre for the Aalto ARTS Building are, however, questionable. Large areas are dependent on daylight coming only from roof lights and the distances between departments are such that connectivity and collaboration possibilities would be a challenge. Essentially, the layout is based on a U-form, which complicates internal connections between the ends of the ‘U’. The placing of so much space below ground is questionable in this climate, although it does open up the possibility of making new connections to neighbouring buildings.

UNIQUENESS
A unique and inspiring solution that would have required a deeper study of movement and accessibility within the internal spaces.
This entry suggests a massive, blocky building, ‘Mount Parnassus’, rising up in a terrace-like way in the centre of the campus area. A smaller counterpart of the building is located in the VTT area. The concrete shell of the building is shrouded with green structures, copper surfaces, and display-like window openings, while the interior is dominated by wooden structures. The multi-storey open central space flows from Otaniemtie in the west towards Alvar Aalto’s former main building, which has been used as one of the starting-points of the design. The excellent presentation of the design projects perhaps a slightly over-positive image of the reality of the building.

The massive structure is positioned relatively schematically in the centre of the open landscape west of the former main building, where the new building towers alone as a huge mass completely dissimilar from the surrounding environment. No positive urban space is formed around the building. Access routes to the metro station, for example, are not solved in a particularly interesting way.

Although the building is shrouded in green, thereby integrating it with the landscape to some extent, its enormous volume and height eclipse the buildings around it, including the former main building. The unobstructed view west from Alvarinaukio would be disrupted by a foreign element, detracting from the auditorium section of the former main building. Close contact with courtyards and the surrounding landscape are characteristic of other parts of Otaniemi and are good starting-points for development. The overall character of the proposed building is closed, although its upper floors provide generous views of the surrounding landscape. Otherwise, however, the massive bulk of this building becomes the dominant feature of the landscape.

The functional spaces of the building are concentrated in a central, roofed open space featuring a stepped formation. While this may create interesting interior views and spaces, promoting contacts between different functions, it is doubtful whether an introverted building this large and high would create an inspiring learning environment.

Because of the great bulk of the building, the potential for phased construction, as well as the flexibility for future changes and additions, is questionable. The large green roofs and walls would also require considerable maintenance to embed the building in the landscape over time as intended.

The design is one of the most personal entries in the competition. The majority of the competition’s functional requirements have been resolved. It remains doubtful, however, whether the ecological objectives set forth by the designer could be achieved in a structure of this scale.
ENTRY 140
"CIRCLE OF LIGHT"

GENERAL
With the exception of a few dramatically protruding diagonal entrance structures, the whole space has been pushed below the present ground level onto several underground floors. The composition is dominated by a circular ‘sunken’ central building and central square, framed by a number of supporting, rectangular sunken gardens. The interior spaces are provided with light through these incisions. Bridges connect the central green field open to everyone to the surrounding environment.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
An architecturally very consistent and carefully executed design. Instead of thinking in buildings and volumes, the designer has attempted to create a new landscape. Pushed underground, however, the facilities remain isolated from the older buildings. It can be asked whether the old Alvar Aalto buildings need to be respected to such an extent. There is very little dialogue between the old and the new as a result.

USABILITY
The deployment of different facilities has been considered carefully, but placing parts of the building deep underground inevitably creates considerable practical problems.

UNIQUENESS
One of the most extreme designs submitted to the competition, and the design has been executed very consistently. The demanding motifs selected by the designer have also been implemented carefully. The entry certainly has some poetic qualities. The open landscape, here refined and cleared of vehicles, is a continuation of the original idea of the Otaniemi campus. Whether this sunken, almost shrine-like world results in any dialogue with the Alvar Aalto buildings is, however, another matter.
ENTRY 142

"techne"

GENERAL
The positioning of the structure in the area is well-founded - the Aalto ARTS Building is located in a good place in regard to its connections and views. The proposal is rather compact and there is still space for constructing additional buildings in the competition area.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The comb-like structure of the Aalto ARTS Building has been concealed beneath a somewhat pretentious roofscape. The architecture of the buildings repeats the same theme in abundance.

USABILITY
The layouts are somewhat schematic, but developable. The Aalto ARTS Building would have benefited from a transversal interior street in the direction of the metro station.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.

ENTRY 150

"DLLM"

GENERAL
This entry extends the perspective from the design of the new school to the overall development of the Otaniemi area, including a seaside terrace. The design features a hub/metropolis building that connects the various functions and structures, a square, and a terrain structure all located southwest of the current library building. This area, which connects the different spaces in Otaniemi, certainly calls for development. In this proposal, however, the idea has been given a relatively foreign form in relation to its immediate surroundings and the Alvar Aalto buildings, which does not strengthen the area and in fact makes it more fragmented to some extent. The actual competition assignment, the Arts Building, has been resolved in an interesting way as a potpourri of rectangular buildings positioned diagonally in relation to each other.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposed Arts Building forms its own island positioned relatively schematically in the centre of the open space west of the former main building. Open space is left around the surrounding buildings, but fails to form a positive urban space or landscape, appearing instead like a series of surplus areas. The
scale of the buildings is appropriate, but no dialogue is established between the new buildings and the existing environment, especially the Alvar Aalto buildings. Access routes to the new metro station also have not been utilised in an interesting way.

USABILITY
The Arts Building constellation provides flexible possibilities for phased construction and visual variation within a scale that links the buildings effectively. The scale of the buildings and the spaces between them could form an inspiring learning environment. The ground plan has been presented on a relatively conceptual level and does not provide actual solutions for implementing the competition’s space requirement.

UNIQUENESS
The proposed constellation of Aalto ARTS Buildings represents an unbroken, distinctive whole. The background reflections on learning environments presented by the designer include some interesting points. Although the design addresses Otaniemi as a wider whole, its overall style feels slightly out of place and fails to provide answers to the question of what an ideal school for the arts would be like in the context of the Alvar Aalto buildings and the campus.

ENTRY 153

"STUDIO CLOUD"

GENERAL
The proposal consists of a rectangular modular tissue that has grown around a very strictly defined central square. This central square features a restaurant and other services, together with commercial facilities, while the various departments of the new school form semi-independent clusters emanating from the central space. The proposal forms a world of its own, which is aesthetically very pleasing but somewhat introverted and perhaps overtly monastic. The plan resembles a series of separate colleges with student living accommodation more than part of an existing university campus. The effect is heightened by the articulation of the roofscape to create atelier spaces for the creative arts. The dramatic, even too vivid, silhouette resembles a collection of roof top attics that are essentially domestic in scale.

The overall result evokes the humanistic spatial qualities found in some of the more established universities, a modern interpretation of the colleges, quadrangles, and intimate courtyards of places like Yale, Cambridge, and Oxford. While the architectural result introduces an almost domestic scale, the planning has been careful to follow a more generic and modular language, offering a fair degree of built-in spatial flexibility and adaptability.
URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE
The entry reflects a very promising and interesting architecture. The new approach square close to the older main building is well-tuned and seems appropriate in scale. The new central courtyard needs to be opened up more towards the new plaza in front of the former main building. A closer relation to the main library building would also create a more intimate prelude to the main square.

Consideration should also be given to introducing more variety of volume within the overall scheme. At present, the main central court is the core of the composition, together with the new arrival plaza outside the former main building. This idea would not be compromised at all if the four departmental clusters were given their own, individual sub-centre, which could be different in size and scale from the predominant module. The essential weakness of this proposal lies in the fact that it does not grow out from the existing surroundings in a natural way. In places, the plan seems random in relation with the other parts of the surrounding campus, as though its constituents have simply been dropped down on the site. The building wing and space north of the former main building have no relation to the most important old buildings. The alley leading from the west towards the library is brutally cut off. The new building volumes partly come too close to the old ones, but are easily adjustable. On the other hand, the introduction of living accommodation, as well as services, should be considered within the existing campus as a whole, as this would bring normal city activities into the location. This proposal contains the seeds of this idea and should be explored further.

On the urban scale, the scheme needs to be further refined and adjusted in relationship to the existing structures. The relationship to and views towards the Alvar Aalto buildings should be rethought. This could be possible because of the potential flexibility of the pavilion-like structural principle of the proposal. The main core of the complex needs to form a more active physical relationship with the main plaza, rather than turn in on itself. This ‘turning in on itself’ is also one of the main criticisms of the design overall.

Stronger spatial connections should be made in general to the surrounding spaces and facilities. The over-articulated roofscape is too restless in this location and needs to be toned down.

USABILITY
The proposal’s main organizational idea is based on a repetitive cell model, which allows for a fair amount of flexibility and adaptability during the life cycle of the buildings. The proposal creates lots of comfortable and quiet places, and the units can offer inspiring workshop and studio space. The many small units, however, make it somewhat expensive as an initial investment in its current form. A higher capital investment would be offset by the built-in flexibility offered, however. The modules could be combined in a variety of ways to form a larger range of different spaces without compromising the basic starting-point. The architecture is of a high quality and is impressive, original, and sympathetic. The potential for developing a high level of constructional, technical, and socially sustainable places is considerable. The basic idea is strong enough in theory to withstand the adjustment and refinement necessary to achieve a more feasible end-result. However, the changes needed would be considerable.
The building spreads out as an extensive, rectangular glass-roofed structure southwest of Otaniementie, with a small section protruding into the area opposite the old library building southwest. A very spacious open landscape is formed northwest of the former main building. The facilities are deployed in a field-like structure divided into open spaces several floors high, while the lower floors are provided with daylight through the high concourse-like open spaces.

The building, dominated by glass surfaces, forms a clear contrast to the former main building and the library, but does not undermine their role in the landscape. The building spreads across a wide area, but leaves a spacious open landscape in front of the former main building and the library. This landscape is not underpinned by any organisation, however. The views towards the old buildings have been left open, but the small connecting wing reaching out to the southernmost tip of the former main building interrupts the view and could be replaced by an underground access route. The vertical scale of the design is appropriate, but its horizontal dimension feels unorganised.

The building creates an impression of flexible and versatile space that could be built in stages. The deployment of different spaces is presented in the form of diagrams. In some ways, the building is based on the universal concrete structures common in production and storage facilities. The use of glass in such a dominant role in both the facades and the roofs may lead to practical problems and would make maintenance challenging.

A distinctive, consistently executed design that brings to mind a production plant or a large greenhouse complex. These elements may result in an interesting workshop and learning environment, but the large, uniform field of buildings feels out of place in this particular campus environment.
ENTRY 168
"UNITED ARTS"

GENERAL
The proposal is skilfully placed in the urban structure. The traffic arrangements are simple and clear. The Aalto ARTS Building is in a good location in terms of connections and views.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The space between the new structures is slightly unclear. The size of the main plaza is somewhat exaggerated and could easily be articulated or landscaped with more greenery. The architecture of the Aalto ARTS Building is professional, but somewhat unsurprising. Some views and the indoor atmosphere look promising.

USABILITY
The floor plans are very sketchy, but evolutionary. The inner connections of the Aalto ARTS Building have been cleverly resolved by a correctly orientated interior passage. The metro station is shown according to the existing plans and could be easily integrated in the new building complex.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.
Phase 1 Individual Evaluation

OTHER ENTRIES
ENTRY 001
"INSIDE OUT"

GENERAL
The proposal is detailed, but the analysis of the urban structure has failed. The proposal divides the competition area in two, which complicates connections and the views from the west to the campus area.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The unbuilt area remains an unclear park lacking an urban idea. The architecture proposed is neutral.

USABILITY
A public space or plaza serving the campus is needed between the metro station and the former main building.

UNIQUENESS
The repetition of similar architectural elements seems monotonous.

ENTRY 002
"023456789A"

GENERAL
The creation of a large crater between the existing buildings has led to an uneasy and difficult solution for ensuring a vibrant and positive relationship between the new ARTS facilities and their immediate neighbours.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
In landscape terms, the scheme leaves the existing extensive external space unresolved, while complicating pedestrian and light traffic routes through the area unnecessarily.

USABILITY
While the scheme offers some great potential for external activities, the effective usage of its major outdoor space is restricted to a short part of the year. Interior spaces would also suffer from possibly insufficient daylight because of the lack of external elevations.

UNIQUENESS
The scheme is undoubtedly unique and memorable in its grand gesture, but this has been achieved at the expense of providing an appropriate working environment.
ENTRY 003
"CONSTELLATION"

GENERAL
The proposal offers an unbiased solution – the spatial programme of the Aalto ARTS Building is located in a ring-formed building. The other buildings also take the form of cylinders or rings located in the competition area. The low-lying buildings leave an unspecified space around them, lacking an urban structure.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal is very sketchy. The solution would have needed a lot of further development to be assertive. The architecture proposed is ethereal and sketchy. The competitive proposal treats its surroundings with indifference.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way.

ENTRY 004
"IMPRINT"

GENERAL
Most of the space in this proposal has been sunk deep down on underground floors, where the rooms surround an interconnecting sunken yard. A great deal of the ground surface remains free as a result, but is treated as little more than deck space. Only small sections of the space, such as the administrative areas and restaurant, are placed above ground.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The solution leaves the views toward the old buildings free. The outdoor space, which is mainly composed of a deck structure and replaces the former open landscape, is not very vibrant. The functions that would vitalize the open space remain mostly underground, and it is laborious to landscape large-scale squares. It is not easy to visualize the features of the new buildings, but the proposed white façade materials may turn out to draw too much attention to themselves.
USABILITY
The locations of the various spaces have clearly been carefully considered. The media premises have also been included. The decision to place so much underground, however, would result in considerable problems related to internal traffic, orientation, and lighting during the daytime.

UNIQUENESS
This is a solution that has been developed consistently, but slavishly avoids any construction above ground. There is no dialogue with the old buildings and the new structures actually avoid them too much.

ENTRY 005
"MELTING ICEBERG"

GENERAL
The proposal is courageous and unprejudiced. However, the analysis of the urban structure has failed. The proposal divides the public areas awkwardly into two. External communications from the campus area towards the west are made more difficult as a result – the massive Aalto ARTS Building is placed in the middle of the pathway and blocks the views.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture proposed is clearly differentiated from its surroundings. The competitive proposal treats the environment designed by Alvar Aalto somewhat indifferently.

USABILITY
The floor plans are very sketchy and elementary.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal includes many interesting ideas, such as the landscaped parklike roof, which would be difficult to realize, however.
ENTRY 006

"DIXIT"

GENERAL
An interesting, but understated attempt to create an infill building that unites the disparate parts of the existing location, while creating a new plaza in front of Alvar Aalto’s main building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The scale and massing of the new elements seem to fit the existing structures, but the use of a continuous wraparound facade is overbearingly monumental in this context, a more sensitive approach would have been called for.

USABILITY
The use of a traditional central corridor typology seems stiff, unresponsive, and inappropriate to the needs of a dynamic creative arts community and make no concessions to providing an inspiring milieu for users.

UNIQUENESS
The scheme’s merits are limited to urban planning level and have not been followed through in the planning of the interior or the architectural ambience of the new buildings.

ENTRY 007

"mr leg"

GENERAL
Despite some attractive and enticing hand drawn sketches, the use of triangular geometries to form the various departments of the new school seems forced and formalistic.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The scheme shows respect for the existing landscape and spatial connections, even if the resulting main plaza is too large to encourage more urban and public intensive activities. The wedge-shaped volumes of the proposal emphasise the collective space, but the way in which they are handled architecturally feels heavy and clumsy.

USABILITY
Routes through the site and the buildings have been considered well. The general disposition of the main facilities works, but the triangular geometry would give rise to difficulties in terms of the adaptability of the generic spaces during the building’s lifespan.

UNIQUENESS
The suggestion has some unique aspects arising from the use of stepped and wedge-like massing, but the treatment of the elevations calls for a radical rethink. The extensive use of green roofs is technically and financially questionable. The techniques and colours used in the presentation make it difficult to read the drawings.
ENTRY 008
"RENGAS TAIVAALLA"

GENERAL
A very mixed bunch of new buildings occupy the competition area and are bound together with some kind of hoisted ring, which almost touches the former main building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Vertical buildings of different shapes are unsuited to this environment. The new structures touch the former main building without showing any respect to the old structure. A new strong, lengthy square motif would make the area more vivid. The entity essentially resembles an amusement park.

USABILITY
The space options have been examined, but placing space in building masses that are quite different from each other and fairly arbitrary in terms of their form is not a viable starting point.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal is bursting with ‘ideas’ that have nothing to do with the location and environment or, for the most part, with the space preferences of the competition programme.

ENTRY 010
"DARKBLUESTAR"

GENERAL
This design makes an attempt to approach the Otaniemi competition assignment from a wider perspective. The new buildings within the competition area are spread between three groups around a spacious green and a market square, which leave the views towards the old Alvar Aalto buildings unobstructed in a commendable way. An undulating area of pools is set in the foreground of the former main building and the library, forming a new principal theme.

The Arts Building is located in a ribbon like structure north of Otaniemietie. A new auxiliary building, which includes research institutions, commercial services, meeting spaces, and the archive (?) is located south of the road. A third group of buildings is formed by a constellation of administrative, media (Lume), exhibition, and commercial space south of the old library. Distributing different services across the area is a good idea, but leaves services isolated from each other.
URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The creation of an open landscape space between the old buildings is a clear starting point. The shape of the space, however, is confusing. The new pool theme may be a welcome addition as such, but provides no new functional solutions and does not feel natural in the foreground of the former main building and the library. All the new groups of buildings are based on low, partly terrace-like lower floors, from which cube-like structures project upwards. The intention is to establish a dialogue with Alvar Aalto’s former main building, which has a similar principal theme. The tall sections of the new buildings and their relatively clumsy shapes do not support this objective, however.

USABILITY
The public spaces of the new buildings are located attractively near the green exterior area. The ground plans and long corridors of the Arts Building appear formulaic, however. Little attention has been paid to access to the metro station.

UNIQUENESS
The combination of low and tall structural sections in different buildings is a distinctive starting point, but has not resulted in very architecturally impressive whole.

ENTRY 012
"AEVI SPATIUM"

GENERAL
The competitive area has been modified extensively in the proposal. The dimensioning of the proposal has failed and weakens the role of the former main building unnecessarily.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The renderings have been prepared with care, but the plan emulates Otaniemi’s architecture with an overall lack of grace and imagination.

USABILITY
The schematically presented layouts are functionally unclear and modest.

UNIQUENESS
The facades of the buildings are quite generic and would need further study to become convincing.
ENTRY 013
"ENOUGH"

GENERAL
A series of segments connected to a sphere rising from a low, but massive podium seems highly artificial and alien. The forms compete very strongly with the existing landmarks and do not form a positive relationship with the surrounding milieu.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
This object-oriented design contributes little to the existing landscape.

USABILITY
The planning is too sketchy and over-schematic to give a clear idea of whether the concept would offer a workable environment for the new school.

UNIQUENESS
The idea is undoubtedly unique in itself but would be an entirely unsuitable neighbour for the existing structures: "Enough" is, unfortunately, too much.

ENTRY 015
"ALMA"

GENERAL
A cleverly studied and presented proposal, the biggest shortcomings of which are dimensional and functional. The massive new structure undermines the external connections and views from the west towards the campus area.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture of the extensive Aalto ARTS Building is interesting, but weakens the role of the former main building unnecessarily.

USABILITY
The floor plans appear rational and flexible.

UNIQUENESS
One of the most interesting proposals inspired by the form of the Aalto vase.
GENERAL
Buildings resembling slices and mainly based on central corridors, including Lume, occupy the major part of the competition area by the side of Otaniementie on the western side of the former main building. Transverse building wings have been located on top of the VTT buildings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The buildings leave free space around their edges and views toward the former main building and library. In most other respects, the planning objectives have largely been ignored. The buildings and their facades form a comb-like composition. Their location in relation to the environment does not seem developable.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and their winding central corridors are schematic.

UNIQUENESS
The facades and their emphasized horizontal features are somewhat original. The overall proposal is not fully mature, however.

GENERAL
The space in this design is located in low-lying green-roofed, landscaped fragments.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The biggest problem is created by the structure’s expansion to unreasonable dimensions, which makes space utilization inefficient. The flowing free-form exterior space creates interesting areas and views. The new buildings are located too close to the former main building with regard to the views and urban landscape, however.

USABILITY
The floor plans are very sketchy and elementary.

UNIQUENESS
The extensive green roof would be difficult to implement.
ENTRY 020
"URUPURU"

GENERAL
An over-scaled and entirely inappropriate addition to the campus in terms of the buildings proposed. The new plaza has merit, forming a dynamic and convincing new urban space. However, the separate Didactic Building is far too close and oppressive in relation to the main building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
A strong relationship with Alvar Aalto’s landmark auditorium seen from the north has been lost, as has the potential of the original northern landscaped spatial axis. The proposed buildings are over-long in this context and give rise to an excessive monumentality, further underlined by the overbearing dominance of the new landmark tower.

USABILITY
Some of the suggested internal planning has potential.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal’s main strength lies in the urban spaces formed around the former main building and the new. Unfortunately, adherence to low structures has led to a gross miscalculation of the horizontal impact of the resulting building masses.

ENTRY 021
"THE HORIZON IS AALTO"

GENERAL
An interesting and professionally produced proposal that locates the bulk of the new school facilities on the eastern part of the site, with the learning centre, commercial, and restaurant spaces forming a linked separate volume connecting to the new metro station.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The resulting composition forms a large, park-like space in the spirit of the ideals of the original campus. The scale of the 3-5 storey volumes has been well-handled.

USABILITY
The spatial planning is effective, but rather ordinary, except for the facilities around the main lobby. The use of traditional central corridors is not conducive for organizing workshops, exhibitions, or providing a clear workshop character for the school. The creative atmosphere sought by the designers has proved elusive.

UNIQUENESS
Despite a careful and sensitive approach, the design does not offer a particularly unique new addition to Aalto University, but rather melts into the existing architectural language of Alvar Aalto’s original architecture.
ENTRY 022

"LEGACY"

GENERAL
A new building accommodating common spaces is located in the form of a round object in the middle of the competition area. The art and architecture spaces are located in a rectilinear building on the north-east edge of Otaniementie. A location has also been indicated for the media centre along Vuorimiehentie.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The location of the buildings leaves plenty of spacious landscape area in the surroundings. The central round building, with its strong cantilevered parts is too dominating, however, and sits uneasily alongside its old neighbours.

USABILITY
Splitting up the main functions into two separate buildings is a poor starting-point functionally speaking. It is difficult to see how the internal traffic of the round building would work. The space in the other building has been planned in greater detail, although the plan solutions are still fairly schematic.

UNIQUENESS
A round building rising on cantilevered parts is undeniably original and provides exceptional space, but the building is badly suited to its surroundings. It would be more appropriate as a sports venue, for example. The proposal is not fully mature.
GENERAL
This design is supported by a number of functional diagrams and illustrations. Special attention has been paid to the network of connections between the old and the new parts of the competition area. The end-result of the design is a maze-like circular structure of multi-angled structural wings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The scale of the circular structure of the approximately four-storey buildings is appropriate to the environment. The buildings, however, take up most of the open space along Otaniementie and make it feel cramped. Although a new square-like space bringing the elements together is set between the wings, there is no natural relationship with the old buildings. The corners of this constellation of new buildings house shared facilities, which look interesting, but only open towards the inside of the new buildings. The existing buildings are left outside this interaction. The long, ribbon-like facades of the buildings are more akin to an airport terminal than an art school.

USABILITY
The floors are presented schematically and the long corridors that dominate the floors are overemphasised. Phased construction and flexible implementation of room groupings would be possible all the same.

UNIQUENESS
The design has a certain logic stemming from its own starting-points. The concept, however, provides no solution for the development of this particular location.
ENTRY 026
"63KLK3017"

GENERAL
Engrossing wall-like buildings are proposed for the competition area. The walls are the strength of this proposal, but also its weakness – the new main building divides the area so efficiently that the buildings and the avenue of linden trees behind it are isolated.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture of the proposal is presented in an elaborate manner and has a clear soul. The proposal takes the former main building and the library and the views towards them into consideration well.

USABILITY
The length of the building would undoubtedly cause functional difficulties, with long internal distances within the building. The form of the building is reflected in the interior as plentiful corridors and repetition. Numerous external staircases weaken the usability of the proposal and would make unstructured movement within the structure difficult; maintenance during the winter would also be difficult. The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way.

UNIQUENESS
The relation of the new to the old is respectful, rather than provocative.
ENTRY 027
"The Magic Carpet"

GENERAL
A monolithic and overlarge megastructure, with tentacles that seem to spread and cut off the connectivity of the existing external spaces, except via deep passages under the new building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The structure is too overbearing to form a harmonious relationship with its neighbours. The plaza in front of the main building is nicely handled, as is the approach from the north, but the smaller wings seem alien and uncomfortable in relation to their neighbours.

USABILITY
The design’s chief merits lie in its internal planning and dynamic spatial ideas.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal is certainly unique, but not in an altogether positive way. The idea could be developed using a series of separate, but interconnected volumes or ‘a fleet of magic carpets’.

ENTRY 028
"Campus Connection"

GENERAL
This design is based on five new buildings and five new squares embedded in the terrain. The buildings are cube-like structures with four to eight floors.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Some interesting dialogue has been established between the new buildings, but it does not extend to the old buildings. Although the new buildings have been pushed below the natural ground level, the tallest buildings unnecessarily compete for dominance with the auditorium section of the former main building. Some of the buildings push right into the foreground of the former main building. The shapes of the very spacious new squares, the green areas, and the exterior areas left around the edges of the old buildings are broken. No inviting market square or spacious, park-like landscapes have been created. The appearance of the new buildings evokes an image of the inflexible world of offices rather than inviting facilities for students.
USABILITY
Attention has been paid to the functional properties of the facilities. The fragmentary, yet inflexible spaces fail to create an image of a well-functioning learning environment, however.

UNIQUENESS
This design stands out from many other entries and is carefully researched. It does not, however, provide any new ideas or starting-points for developing this particular location.

ENTRY 029
"PIAZZA BOLOGNESE"

GENERAL
The proposal is well-founded from an urban structural point of view, but is unfinished. There are some good themes but they have been developed in only a sketchy way.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal falls far below the high level of architecture in the environment designed by Alvar Aalto. The new structures come too close to the former main building and library. Such a close location would call for a higher standard of architecture.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown only in a very elementary way.

UNIQUENESS
The repetition of similar architectural elements in all parts of the new buildings has a monotonous feel to it.
ENTRY 030
"Four By Four"

GENERAL
From the urban structural point of view, this proposal feels haphazard. The new buildings weaken the site’s external connections and the views from the west towards the campus area.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new central plaza is modest and undefined.

USABILITY
The building layouts are schematic and lack imagination, which is appropriate to the proposal’s industrial image.

UNIQUENESS
With its recurring lamellas and industrial halls, the proposal makes too ordinary an impression close to buildings designed by Alvar Aalto.

ENTRY 031
"CR74340"

GENERAL
The proposal shifts the urban focus to a new tower and circular plaza close to the new metro station, leaving the rest of the site to be encircled by various office block-like volumes housing the school’s separate departments. The concept is alien to Otaniemi, to the idea of the Arts building, and to the landmark nature of the main auditorium.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The resulting external spaces are too internalised and have an uncomfortable relationship with the existing milieu. Some of the architectural ideas are interesting, but not exactly original.

USABILITY
The design does not readily encourage synergy and cooperation between different departments.
GENERAL
This proposal is based on ring-shaped and cylindrical buildings that have been placed in the competition area in a rather haphazard manner. A lot of unspecified space remains around the low cylindrical buildings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new buildings weaken the site’s external connections and the views from the west towards the campus area.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown only in a very elementary way.

UNIQUENESS
The repetition of similar architectural elements in all parts of the new buildings has a monotonous feel to it.

ENTRY 032
"archipelago"

GENERAL
Most of the competition area is covered by a deck structure. The space under the deck receives light through yard openings. Additional structures rise from the deck and the right-angled building masses of the southern and western end.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The location of the buildings provide a lot of free space and the views toward the old buildings also remain intact. The large deck area is, however, problematic. As a square, it is over-extensive and difficult to adapt into a planted landscape area. The ‘emerging’ buildings seem scattered.

USABILITY
The plan solutions of the buildings offer quite a lot of flexible adaptability, although the distances involved are long. The internal milieu under the deck does not feel appealing.

UNIQUENESS
The volumes of the new buildings above ground here have been countered by using extensive underground construction. The buildings have a plain outward appearance, similar to functional commercial buildings. The extensive deck area is given too dominant a position.

ENTRY 033
"in the woods"

GENERAL
This proposal is based on ring-shaped and cylindrical buildings that have been placed in the competition area in a rather haphazard manner. A lot of unspecified space remains around the low cylindrical buildings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new buildings weaken the site’s external connections and the views from the west towards the campus area.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown only in a very elementary way.

UNIQUENESS
The repetition of similar architectural elements in all parts of the new buildings has a monotonous feel to it.
GENERAL
This design, supported by numerous diagrams, emphasises the open landscapes of the Otaniemi area. Somewhat surprisingly, the end-result is a series of arcing and winding wings that split the open space alongside Otaniementie into several sections while blocking the space in the middle with buildings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The design is characterised by a very consistent architectural touch and expression. The buildings have a certain streamlined elegance and offer something of a choreographed performance. The vertical scale of the design is appropriate. The foreground of the former main building and the library is framed by a new square called the Aino Cultural Plaza. The other green squares also have their own, designated character. The important view from the north towards the auditorium of the former main building has been obstructed. This could be corrected perhaps, but may prove difficult within the framework of the overall design.

USABILITY
The planning principles follow a clear collegial university concept of clearly separated departments, each with their own identity. Despite the short distances, the arrangement does not offer an easy way of encouraging cooperation and interaction between different disciplines, one of the main aims of the new school.

UNIQUENESS
A pleasing, but not especially memorable proposal.

ENTRY 034
"ILMATAR"

ENTRY 035
"BLENDING ENVIRONMENTS"
USABILITY
The ground plans and deployment of the various functions appears well-researched and considered, but the arcing shapes and the numerous sharp exterior angles are inevitably constrained. Flexible phased construction and a potential for versatility and later changes are difficult to implement in an integrated basic solution like this. Access routes to and from the metro station are difficult to find.

UNIQUENESS
This elegantly presented design is, in its way, unique. Although the design emphasises landscape values, the positioning of the buildings obstructs a number of important views.

GENERAL
A meticulously presented proposal, the biggest shortcomings of which are dimensional and aesthetic. Although the mass of the new Aalto ARTS Building is divided into parts, it is still too large in proportion to the main building designed by Alvar Aalto.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The massive new construction is located in the correct place, but the metro station and the other new structures proposed remain separate from the cityscape. The facades of the buildings are unsurprising and ordinary.

USABILITY
The new Aalto ARTS Building has a compact layout that can be developed, but the ground plans are only indicative.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.
ENTRY 038
"KUA"

GENERAL
Another inward-looking entry that ignores the importance of some of the existing surrounding buildings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The area in front of the main building has been relegated to a large, ground-level car park, which must be seen as a serious mistake. The inclusion of a large number of small wooden buildings is not convincing. The architectural form is reminiscent of speculative office buildings.

USABILITY
The internal planning is competent, but stiff, and the design does not provide adequate opportunities for departmental interaction.

ENTRY 039
"NETWORKED TISSUE"

GENERAL
The design fills the open spaces of the competition area almost completely with flat, relatively low buildings, with narrow walkways between them.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
In terms of vertical scale, this design does not conflict with the existing environment. The long, relatively monotonous vertical facades framing the walkways, however, are problematic in terms of their horizontal scale. The shapes of the exterior spaces created or left near the old buildings are not very successful. The bulky mass of the buildings blocks the views towards the former main building, particularly from the north. The new facades also fail to establish a dialogue with the old buildings.

USABILITY
The ground plan appears to be carefully considered and has clear potential for phased construction and flexible changes subsequently. The design would not appear to offer a very inspiring learning environment, however.

UNIQUENESS
The design appears to be relatively carefully researched, but its overall character is more akin to a large shopping mall than a university campus.
GENERAL
The proposal is based on a composition formed by a curvy-walled low building and two high lamellas. The proposal does not create sufficiently clearly defined urban spaces. The plaza defined by the curvy-walled building remains unspecified and powerless. The urban dimension is ‘missing’.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The overall scale of the buildings is too large for the existing environment.

USABILITY
The floor plans are very sketchy and elementary.

UNIQUENESS
The facades of the buildings are quite generic and would need further study to become convincing.

ENTRY 041

“plow”

GENERAL
An interesting attempt to retain and strengthen Alvar Aalto’s original concept of having separate building complexes juxtaposed with alternating woodland, forest clearings, or open meadows.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The strategy has led to a very elongated structure for the new building, which creates some positive new external spaces. The building volumes have received a variety of architectural treatments, not all of which are entirely convincing.

USABILITY
Although each department’s internal planning has development potential, it would be difficult to achieve the kind of interaction and collaboration between different disciplines envisaged by Aalto University’s pedagogical strategy.

UNIQUENESS
The design contains some positive new thinking, but would need radical reworking before it would sit naturally and effortlessly in the Otaniemi environment.
ENTRY 042  
”πr²”

GENERAL
This entry consists of a constellation of larger and smaller square-shaped buildings in the open spaces northwest of the former main building and southwest of the library. In addition, a large, unbroken series of spaces below ground level is set immediately northwest of the former main building into the building’s pedestal.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The design successfully takes the views towards the old building and the library as its starting-point. The locations of the new buildings, however, feel scattered and unfocused, and result in fragmented exterior spaces. Although the buildings have been designed with considerable skill, they remain isolated, particularly the largest structure. Their scale and overall appearance have no counterpart in the existing buildings. The front square by the former main building is an idea that could be developed, but is oversized and empty on the scale proposed.

USABILITY
The ground plan is carefully thought-through and special attention has been paid to the layout of the largest building. The design features some very precise work. The floor below ground level features good connections between the various buildings, the metro station, and the former main building. It is a pity, however, that most of it is underground.

UNIQUENESS
A carefully researched and professional design that, unfortunately, does not offer very promising prospects for further development in this particular location.
ENTRY 043
"THE BIG CURVE"

GENERAL
Two new buildings occupy a large part of the competition area in the direction of Otaniementie: a curved building that mostly includes common spaces and a rectilinear building that includes specialized teaching premises. A large central square is placed in front of the former main building, and shops at its south-western end, not far from the metro station. There is a large pool near the square, which is delimited by a curved building mass.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
In addition to the large square, very little free open space has been left near the buildings, excluding the south-western side of the old library. A curved five-floor building frames the western side of the former main building and its auditorium. Instead of having an accompanying role, this building draws most of the attention to itself. The stiff facades dominated by steel, patterned glass, and other features do not engage in a dialogue with Alvar Aalto’s buildings.

USABILITY
A number of location options have been considered when developing the floor plans, but the proposal offers only fairly schematic spaces. The long corridors of the curved building resemble a large office or hotel and do not provide any interesting places for people to interact with each other.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal has been prepared with care and good professional competence but the location of the buildings and their outward appearance seem very strange in relation to the location. The buildings resemble a highly refined production plant with accompanying offices, rather than an inspiring study environment.
ENTRY 044
"RIANS"

GENERAL
This proposal places an extensive Aalto ARTS Building to the north of Otaniementie. With regard to views and the cityscape, the proposal is well thought-out, but not ideal in terms of connections.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The connection from the Aalto ARTS Building to the metro station is likely to be problematic, as the connections proposed by the designer cannot be executed as a direct underground link. The scale of the proposal is large and its use of space is inefficient.

USABILITY
The layout schemes of the buildings are schematic and lack imagination, and reflect a flawed spatial hierarchy.

UNIQUENESS
The facades of the buildings are unsurprising and ordinary.

ENTRY 045
"Acampus"

GENERAL
The proposed sizable glass building stands out strongly in its environment, even though it is placed at a slight distance from the university milieu designed by Alvar Aalto.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal – in the shape of the letter A – is constrained and is not well-grounded in the cityscape. The building seems unnecessarily large and inefficient.

USABILITY
Large surfaces made of glass are problematic in terms of energy efficiency.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal is reminiscent of a gigantic greenhouse and tends to invoke confusion rather than admiration.
ENTRY 046
"MEADOW"

GENERAL
A simple and daring addition to the redbrick harmony of Otaniemi that creates an interesting dialogue with the existing milieu. The high, long slab mass would be highly questionable in this context, handsome and dynamic though it is.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The addition of a one-two storey new podium structure creates two new major external spaces, an urban plaza in front of the main building and a new park to the north. The potential of the large roof’s learning landscape in winter conditions would need further study.

USABILITY
The ground-level plan is one of the most convincing in the competition, forming a kind of small village centre. The location of the various departments in a long, 8-storey slab block needs a rethink, however.

UNIQUENESS
A memorable scheme that unfortunately contains some fundamental problems of scale and fit.

ENTRY 047
"PER ASPERA AD ASTRA"

GENERAL
A messy and amorphous semi-organic megastructure that sits uncomfortably close to the main building and library.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The inclusion of a through road continuation of Otaniemietie is contrary to the brief and has created some disturbing and contradictory impact on the landscape. The free-hand sketches have charm and recall those of the 1950s and early 1960s.

USABILITY
The internal spatial planning is competently and professionally resolved.

UNIQUENESS
The resulting complex is more reminiscent of a large out-of-town shopping centre than a new and innovative university facility.
ENTRY 048
"GREEN HEART"

GENERAL
The purpose of this design is to use ‘contemporary’ streamlined expression to create a contrast to Alvar Aalto’s ‘Euclidian’ architecture. A closed, arcing circle frames a new, spacious green square.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The design’s contemporary style forms a contrast to the surrounding architecture, but its large scale and streamlined shapes fail to establish a positive dialogue with the environment. The central green may be a sound starting-point, but it is too inward-looking to fit in with the adjacent existing buildings.

USABILITY
Long, racetrack-like corridors do not offer an inspiring learning environment. Access routes to and from the metro station have not been utilised.

UNIQUENESS
From the perspective of its own starting-points, the design has been executed carefully. It does not, however, answer the question of how the Otaniemi campus could be developed. The design is more akin to motor sports structures than something intended to form a learning environment. The reference to Alvar Aalto’s Savoy vase is superficial to say the least and hardly a fitting way to pay homage to Aalto’s architecture.
ENTRY 049
"metsä (1)"

GENERAL
The proposal occupies most of the competition area at the north-western side of the former main building, with a potpourri of buildings that curve and rise up to various levels, even higher than 10 storeys.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The buildings have been located to avoid any square spaces or free landscape spaces and related views connected to the old buildings. In terms of scale, the buildings crush the former main building and also protrude into the view from Alvarinaukio to the west.

USABILITY
Location options have been studied, but there are a number of questions regarding the functionality of internal traffic.

UNIQUENESS
The curved forms and yard spaces that flow between them produce some fascinating spaces. The environment they create could be a natural solution for a large terminal and related commercial premises, but the design is completely alien as a study environment alongside the old campus and Alvar Aalto’s buildings.

ENTRY 050
"MANGO 55"

GENERAL
The proposal, which is largely landscaped underground, is interesting, but problematic in terms of the urban structure and feasibility. The square space seems too vast, but could easily be articulated or landscaped with more greenery.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The connections from the west towards the campus area are complicated due to the plaza, which is beneath street level. The ground water level and the flood height are so close to the surface that any premises proposed below the present street level would be difficult and expensive to realize. It would also be difficult to achieve unrestricted access to the exterior premises. The extensive parking deck would be expensive to build and maintain.

USABILITY
Location options have been studied, but there are a number of questions regarding the functionality of internal traffic.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal is carefully presented, but unrealistic. The extensive depth of the new buildings would result in dark and unpleasant interiors.

Some views and the atmosphere look promising.
ENTRY 051
"Calamari_425631"

GENERAL
A series of six separate 3-4 storey island-like buildings gathered around a large grass-roofed collective service centre creates an interesting dialogue with the existing environment.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The spaces between the islands are interesting, but the new main square, although strategically located at the crossroads of number of routes, is unnecessarily internalised and needs to have a stronger contact with the university’s main building. The architectural treatment is contemporary and humanly scaled.

USABILITY
The underground path of knowledge serves as an umbilical link between the separate departments. Some of the internal spaces would be difficult to use.

UNIQUENESS
Despite introducing a new and refreshing element to Otaniemi’s rectilinear geometry, the concept does not establish sufficient spatial arrangements to encourage interaction between departments.

ENTRY 053
"SPACE DIVISIONS"

GENERAL
This proposal is based on rod-like structures that clearly divide the competition area into parts. The solution is interesting, but feels a little pretentious. Original sub-sections are created, but these disrupt the site’s connections and overall integrity.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The solution feels crude and indifferent.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way. The space inside the rods is likely to be ineffective and difficult to use. The distances between the various departments are long and would make interaction and creating a sense of community difficult.

UNIQUENESS
The views and atmosphere are personal and unique.
ENTRY 054
**“Hummingbird”**

**GENERAL**
A new, crescent-shaped plaza is the main merit of this ecologically motivated entry.

**URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE**
The scale and scope of the new urban space is pleasant and the location of the main parking hall beneath is justified.

**USABILITY**
The internal spatial arrangements are somewhat stiff and traditional. The deployment of central corridors and cul-de-sacs does not offer a particularly inspiring learning environment or the potential for interdepartmental interaction.

**UNIQUENESS**
The aim of producing a more sustainable building complex is a commendable approach, but the level of technical innovation has not produced a particular original or attractive architecture.

ENTRY 055
**“E12-005”**

**GENERAL**
A large, oversized parallelepiped-shaped building and an adjacent lower side wing framing a courtyard occupy the open spaces along Otaniemietie almost completely and, for the most part, formulaically. Lume has been integrated into the constellation of buildings.

**URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE**
The positioning of the buildings within the site feels inflexible. The principal views towards the former main building have been taken into account. No positive dialogue is established between the new and old buildings, however. The shape of the new buildings feels schematic.

**USABILITY**
The different functions have been deployed relatively carefully. The new Arts Building is more akin to a large office structure rather than an inspiring learning environment, however.

**UNIQUENESS**
Although the design is carefully thought-out in many ways, it fails to convey a positive image of a new centre for arts studies.
ENTRY 056
"THE SQUARE"

GENERAL
The proposal evokes undefined images. Its scale is reminiscent of a factory and sadly overshadows the former main building designed by Alvar Aalto. It also fails to create sufficient clearly defined urban spaces.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The massive new structure would weaken exterior connections and the views from the west to the campus area.

USABILITY
The plan is sketchy and functionally incomplete although the lay-out of the proposal has been presented with care.

ENTRY 058
"LENSLIFE"

GENERAL
A grossly overblown and massive arrangement of slab-like blocks, which only succeeds in dominating the existing milieu in a threatening and arrogant manner.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The approach to the existing context is too aggressive and lacks a human scale.

USABILITY
The internal planning arrangements are sketchy, but professional. The dialogue and connectivity between the massive slab blocks is tenuous and highly questionable.

UNIQUENESS
It is a shame that the designers’ considerable professional skills have not resulted in a more sensitive response to the competition’s challenge. The central, partly sunken wedge-shaped plaza is the most positive feature of the design.
**GENERAL**
The new buildings are located in a rectangular area on the north-western side of the former main building, nearly filling up this part of the competition area. A larger building with a based shaped like a sharp-angled triangle includes teaching premises and a media centre. A narrower, diagonal building on the north-eastern edge includes mainly administrative premises. A square space is located between the buildings and at various levels.

**URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE**
The building leaves the landscape areas located immediately in front of the former main building and library free. The view from the north-west toward the auditorium of the former main building has been taken into account by turning the square between the new buildings towards it. At ground level, the distant visual connection has been cut off, however.

The buildings themselves have hugely compact outward appearances. A five-storey mass opposite the former main building is overbearing. The facades of the new buildings look like a giant office complex, rather than an educational establishment.

**USABILITY**
A number of location options have been studied in the floor plans. The proposal presents inflexible spaces, however, that lack any attractive places for people to interact with each other.

**UNIQUENESS**
The proposal does not provide much that would create a positive dialogue between the new and old buildings.
ENTRY 060
"CLEAR IN THE WOODS"

GENERAL
The spatial programme here is located in a massive building complex consisting of seven towers and a free-form plaza with a restaurant and other facilities located on its rim. The plaza, shaped like an Aalto vase, is impressive, but treats the existing environment as if it does not exist.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture reflects a determined hand, but treats the environment with nonchalance. The proposed buildings weaken the site’s external connections and the proposed woods would weaken the views from the west towards the campus area.

USABILITY
Functionally speaking, the design is fragmentary and inefficient. The floor plans shown are very sketchy, but promising.

UNIQUENESS
The repetition of similar architectural elements in all parts of the new buildings seems somewhat monotonous.

ENTRY 061
"SOPHIA"

GENERAL
From an urban structural point of view, the proposal is well presented. The design maintains the site’s external connections and the views from the west towards the campus area.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
In cityscape terms, the relationship with the environment is problematic, as the proposal’s architecture is alien in the controlled red-brick milieu of Otaniemi. The overall scale of the Aalto ARTS Building is too large for the existing environment.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way.
ENTRY 062
"ATLAS"

GENERAL
A messy and overbearing attempt to introduce a more sculptural design into the campus landscape by relegating Alvar Aalto’s main building and library to secondary roles.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The terraced architecture is unconvincing and seems to turn its back on the existing main building. The central space formed between the four main stepped masses is reminiscent of a collection of tourist hotels.

USABILITY
The connections and interactions between the school’s departments would be problematic.

ENTRY 064
"EurAm_012"

GENERAL
The main volume of the complex of buildings is located north of Otaniementie, with an arc-shaped new building located south of the road. A series of squares on different levels is formed between them.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The overall feel of the design is generous, but the series of squares is massive and lacks scale. No positive square space or landscape is formed. The shapes feel broken and aggressive in places. No dialogue is generated with Alvar Aalto’s buildings.

USABILITY
The different functions are deployed in a way that would make navigating between them a challenge. The larger building on the north side has an interior gallery that brings the elements together, but it remains isolated from the rest of the complex. The driveway/ramp in front of the old library is unsightly.

UNIQUENESS
The long horizontal rooftops form the dominant theme of this design. The resulting exterior spaces are not very attractive, however.
ENTRY 065
"ID75871"

GENERAL
A cellular network of buildings that occupies the entire site.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The designer’s idea seems to have been to create a new open landscape between the old buildings by means of earth-covered roofs. The relationship with the old buildings remains completely unresolved, however. The new structure feels bolted on to the surrounding environment.

USABILITY
Some layout schemes have been presented, but they do not show how functional the design would be. In fact, it seems impossible to estimate this aspect. It is unclear how people would pass from one yard space to another and how they would enter the earth-covered roofs from outside.

UNIQUENESS
The cellular structure of the buildings could provide an interesting starting-point, but the design is little more than a preliminary sketch.

ENTRY 066
"SHIBA"

GENERAL
This carefully presented proposal divides the design into two parts. The design places the connection between Otaniementie Street towards the west underground, with a deck and bridges placed between the groups of buildings. The solution is cumbersome, both technically and from the cityscape perspective.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
In places, the environment is slightly dreary, particularly because of the over-dimensional road traffic arrangements. The architecture is neutral and unsurprising – the buildings would have benefited from a more personal touch.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way.

UNIQUENESS
Green-roofed buildings with terraces are sympathetic as such.
ENTRY 067
”The Canopy”

GENERAL
A messy and confusing entry that feels greatly at odds with the existing environment, despite its ecological agenda.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The almost baroque approach to the form of both buildings and the spaces between them seems to be competing for attention with the main building.
ENTRY 068
"New Vessels"

GENERAL
The proposal is illustrated with vivid drawings and perspective drawings. The space is divided into two long, oval wings, between which a monumental view toward the former main building opens up.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The designer presents a selection of impressive background ideas for the plan, which appears to have nothing in common with these apparent sources of inspiration, however. The proposal is completely devoid of any links to the local conditions. The style of the proposal could perhaps be appropriate for an environment of its own, isolated from the rest of the world, and it does not provide any additional positive value for the development of the Otaniemi campus.

USABILITY
The layouts of the spaces show how various functions would be located in the wings and floors, but it is difficult to estimate the functionality of these internal spaces.

UNIQUENESS
A broad-minded proposal based on streamlined forms, which – apart from a few emphasized axis views – is not connected with its environment in any way and does not engage in any dialogue with the old buildings. The streamlined forms resemble a large terminal building.
ENTRY 070
"A CLEARING IN THE WOODS”

GENERAL
The proposal fails in respect of the urban structure and is undeveloped in respect of the cityscape.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The design is nonchalant with regard to the existing campus. The extensive water theme is over-dimensioned and would be difficult to realize. The facades of the buildings are not successful either.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way.

UNIQUENESS
The repetition of similar architectural elements throughout the new buildings seems somewhat monotonous.

ENTRY 071
"s10s10s10s10"

GENERAL
A squadron of Stealth-like forms appears to have occupied a central landing strip, bearing little, if any, affinity with the existing environment.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The main building is hemmed in by the new, and the series of new, small courtyards and squares are too similar to each other. The aggressive and grotesque forms of the buildings are disturbing.

UNIQUENESS
Architecturally, the design is an escapee from an old Star Wars movie.
ENTRY 072
"Landscape forum"

GENERAL
The major premises of this proposal have been concentrated in a high, cube-style building located in the middle of an open field at the western side of the former main building. The designer clearly wants to create a new, high-profile symbol for Aalto University and a new landmark for Espoo as a whole.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The goals of the design are far removed from the competition programme, which is to create an interesting dialogue between the new buildings and Alvar Aalto’s main building and library. The height of the building is totally alien in this respect. A main central building does have the advantage of offering a lot of free space around it, however.

USABILITY
The functionality of the space in the new main building as an inspiring learning environment is doubtful.

UNIQUENESS
This is a surprising proposal for a university building. With its high internal halls, it resembles a congress hotel more than a university building. The relationship with the old buildings is aggressive.

ENTRY 073
"KOENHEID"

GENERAL
This proposal is based on a group of triangles with rounded surface forms. The design is somewhat pretentious with regard to the urban structure and undeveloped in terms of the local cityscape.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal’s relationship with the existing campus seems slight and haphazard.

USABILITY
Locating departments in completely separate buildings is the worst possible solution with regard to functionality and flexibility.

UNIQUENESS
The repetition of similar architectural elements throughout the new buildings seems somewhat monotonous.
ENTRY 074
"PIAZZA"

GENERAL
The proposal is based on a group of numerous, chained buildings around a light court. The proposal is well thought-out with regard to the urban structure, although the sunken piazza complicates the site’s connections and would be difficult to realize.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal’s relationship with the existing campus seems slight and schematic.

USABILITY
Forcing activities into almost identical structures is a bad solution with regard to functionality.

UNIQUENESS
Extensive repetition makes the proposal slightly dreary in cityscape terms.

ENTRY 076
"SURF ‘N’ TURF"

GENERAL
A promising starting-point that creates a variety of new public spaces by splitting the new ARTS facilities into two separate, but interconnected building masses.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The design has a number of similarities with the “Ainoa” entry and combines both landscape and architecture into a new hybrid building typology. More attention should have been paid to the relationship with the main building: the main focus is now on the Metro Forum.

USABILITY
The internal spatial planning of the design is professional and assured, although splitting the space is likely to be less than satisfactory. The perspective views evoke an image of a stimulating place to work and study in. The sloping roof surface of the main Aalto ARTS Building complements Alvar Aalto’s auditorium quite successfully.

UNIQUENESS
The end-result is reasonably memorable and has potential. Its main weakness lies in how workable splitting the craft facilities and the studio spaces in the main buildings would be.
ENTRY 077
"THE CAVERN"

GENERAL
An arrogant and unappealing entry, which takes no cue from the existing location and would be more at home in Asia or the Middle East rather than Otaniemi.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The collection of leaning building slabs sets up an uncomfortable and competing relationship with Alvar Aalto’s auditorium.

ENTRY 078
"FOUR TREE AVENUE"

GENERAL
The starting-point of this design is to establish connections to the surrounding areas and their functions. Two triangular main structures are located south of Otaniementie. The north side of the road houses restaurants and, quite surprisingly, shops and a market square.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The principal views have been taken into account. The shapes of the squares feel rigid and fragmented, however. They do not form clear-cut squares, but are not part of the landscape either. The axis towards the former main building is given an overtly monumental form. The buildings lack flexibility.

USABILITY
The design integrates urban functions into the area, but fails to locate them very successfully.

UNIQUENESS
The design has some personal touches in the positioning of the buildings. Their shapes, however, fail to establish a positive dialogue between the old buildings and the new.
ENTRY 079
"CROSSOVER"

GENERAL
The new building, in the form of a slanting cross, has been raised on slanting poles, and is located on the western side of the administrative wing of the former main building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new building leaves a spacious landscape area around it. Although the main views toward the former main building and library remain unchanged, the new building comes disturbingly close to the former main building. No interconnecting square has been created. The building is modelled in a rigid style, like an office building from decades ago.

USABILITY
The designer has carefully specified the spaces included in the competition programme. The plan solutions are rigid, however, and largely schematic. The Arts Building itself seems somewhat undersized.

UNIQUENESS
The designer has not succeeded in creating a developable initial proposal.

ENTRY 080
"THE TURING TEST"

GENERAL
A latter-day Pompidou Centre, offering a high degree of monoor generic spaces within a high-tech wooden megastructure.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Despite being conceived as a long megastructure, the height of the building is tuned to the surroundings. The new park-like triangular plaza works well. The wooden structural emphasis is intriguing, but the widespread use of glass in both the roof and facades needs careful handling in the Finnish climate. The structure could be developed to provide column-free internal spaces.

USABILITY
The approach has numerous similarities with the “Birch and Brick” entry, but the image it conveys is more akin to a large-scale industrial installation than to a new and innovative learning and research centre.

UNIQUENESS
A unique and memorable design, with the distinction of providing a real workshop atmosphere for the creative arts.
**GENERAL**
This design is based on a clearly and resolutely limited urban space that opens towards the former main building and the library. The solution is well grounded in the cityscape with regard to the site’s connections and views.

**URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE**
The design is well-presented, but the architecture and interiors suffer from repetition and a lack of surprises.

**USABILITY**
The paved piazza is over-dimensional. The distances within the elongated buildings would probably prove long and unattractive for users.

**UNIQUENESS**
In terms of communality, the proposal feels incomplete.

---

**ENTRY 082**

"**NEPHELO**"

**GENERAL**
The building is a statuesque free-form object with embedded light courts.

**URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE**
The architecture of the building is strong and original, but the design’s relation to the existing campus does not feel grounded and appears haphazard.

**USABILITY**
The design would be technically demanding to realize and its interior spaces are inefficient. The wide shell structures are difficult to evaluate technically and economically. The interior spaces are unstructured and unclear.
ENTRY 083
"Metsä (2)"

GENERAL
The building is conceived as an intersection. A poetic and beautifully presented entry that spreads the space over almost the entire available area. This creates problems with continuity between the external areas, despite the provision of internal routes and light traffic routes via the roof.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Replacing the campus’ green areas with new raised terraces could have been avoided by condensing and compacting the main building. Architecturally, the repetitive light scoops/ventilation shafts/supporting columns are extremely attractive.

USABILITY
The strategy lends itself to forming a variety of both fixed and flexible spaces; the example shown reveals the author’s professional competence. However, the distances between facilities internally are excessive.

UNIQUENESS
A memorable and elegant solution that would require judicious reworking to make it more feasible. This could be achieved without undermining the entry’s main ideas.

ENTRY 084
"LIGHT AND AIR AMONGST TREES"

GENERAL
The design starts off with an analysis of the surrounding landscape, but, in a surprising touch, features an inflexible symmetrical monumental composition of buildings focused on two cube-like structures of excessive height.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The tall, massive structures and their inflexible positioning feel completely out of place in this environment and they severely eclipse Alvar Aalto’s main building. The principal views towards the main building have been taken into account, but the view from the west is over-emphasised. The tall, massive structures also intrude into and disrupt the views from Alvariaukio.

USABILITY
The strategy lends itself to forming a variety of both fixed and flexible spaces: the example shown reveals the author’s professional competence. However, the distances between facilities internally are excessive.

UNIQUENESS
A very personal design, but completely out of place in this environment.
ENTRY 085
"HEOR"

GENERAL
A very heavy-handed entry that sits uncomfortably in this context.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
With the exception of the crescent-shaped building facing towards the main building, the design is more reminiscent of faceless government offices than a new, innovative centre for the creative arts. The 3D studies, however, look more promising than the elevation or aerial massing drawings.

ENTRY 086
"ALEAIACTAEST"

GENERAL
This design consists of a few tall, sculptural main structures that leave the spacious campus landscape open as a green area.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The composition of the design has a certain power and grace. The objective of the design is apparently to establish a dialogue of structures with the dominant element (the auditorium) of Alvar Aalto’s main building. The vertical scale of the buildings is out of place in this environment, however. The new buildings are too dominant and impinge on the views of Alvarinakio.

USABILITY
The presentation is very schematic, which makes a functional evaluation difficult. Elongated tower blocks are more suitable for offices and hotels rather than the arts faculty of a university.

UNIQUENESS
The starting-points of this design stand out, yet it fails to answer how the location could be further developed in the future.
ENTRY 087
”CONNECTING CAMPUS”

GENERAL
The proposal is based on four very long, upraised rectangles, under which interconnecting common spaces have been created through various ‘hillocks’.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal leaves landscape spaces along its edges, but the landscape has been fragmented. The views toward the former main building and library have not been taken into account. The avenue of trees from the south-west, for example, hits the new building. Interconnecting landscapes or squares are missing, and any interaction with the old buildings is also missing. The new buildings are broad-minded but excessively long in relation to their surroundings. There is a certain spaciousness in the internal space views.

USABILITY
The architectonic approach seems to be strongly rationalistic. The extensively long corridors are unlikely to create an interesting and interactive learning environment, however. The ‘hillocks’, which are intended to serve as meeting hubs are primarily traffic junctions.

UNIQUENESS
With its long building wings, this design represents an extreme alternative. It cannot be regarded as developable in this location, however.
ENTRY 088
"KULLERVO"

GENERAL
The new buildings are divided into two top-lit structures with ground plans formed of triangles. The buildings are framed by taller and narrower structures at their corners. A smaller building located southwest of the old library has been designated for media facilities and a theatre. A varied series of relatively large squares is formed between the new buildings and the old library and main building, and a pool is located opposite the main building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The buildings and the associated squares strive for an urban rather than a landscape-based whole. The principal views towards the former main building and the library have been taken as the design’s starting-points in a commendable way. The square formed in front of the library that brings the different elements together stands out from the mass of designs submitted for the competition. The squares are slightly oversized, however; the areas designated for trees and green spaces could be given a bigger role. The shape of the roof structure, which provides top-lighting for the lower sections of the buildings, is interesting, but is too dominant a motif for connecting the learning facilities. The problem with this design is the large scale and bulky appearance of the tall, angular wing sections, especially near the main building (west side).

USABILITY
Combining functions that serve the university’s facilities and the district is a sound starting-point. Access from the metro station has been taken into account, and the functions have been carefully located generally speaking.

UNIQUENESS
A well-researched design within its own starting-points. Placing the most important learning facilities under a large, top-lit ceiling is somewhat grandiose. No natural dialogue is established between the old buildings and the relatively bulky mass of the new buildings, however.
GENERAL
This design is based on a composition of various shapes and pieces. The design’s relationship to the cityscape is undeveloped.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The facades of the buildings are quite generic and would need further study to become convincing.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way. The renderings have been prepared skilfully.

UNIQUENESS
The design’s relationship with the existing campus entity has not been thought through and feels haphazard.

ENTRY 090
“the blanket vs. the shed”

GENERAL
It is unclear why the designers have seen fit to cover the entire area with an undulating roof surface, which seems to engulf some of the main existing buildings, and place an unrelated shed-like building on stilts above this surface! Totally unconvincing.
ENTRY 091
"A70"

GENERAL
This design is based on a compact block of buildings and large subterranean premises, together with embedded light courts. The main mass is located effectively with regard to the cityscape, although its scale is oversized.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
While an original design, its relationship with the existing campus has not been thought through and feels haphazard.

USABILITY
Distributing the exterior space between different levels compromises the site’s connections and would be technically difficult to realize.

ENTRY 092
"Between two worlds"

GENERAL
The design is based on a large deck plane located in the area of Otaniemietie and along its northern side. Large spaces have been placed under the deck, partly lit from above. A split-level row of four square buildings, including a media centre, have been placed on top of the deck. A rectangular administrative building is located on the southern side of Otaniemietie.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The southernmost part of the former main building and the front areas of the old library have been left as free landscape space. The new row of buildings comes close to the auditorium part of the main building and obscures people’s prime views of this structure. There is no interconnecting square space here. The deck structures play too dominant a role in the design. It remains somewhat unclear how the edges of the deck are connected to the surroundings. The new buildings do not establish a dialogue with Alvar Aalto’s buildings.
GENERAL
The low Aalto ARTS Building is a wide and, from the cityscape point of view, a slightly dreary hall-like entity. Locating exterior space on different levels also causes problems. The piazza, which is placed below street level, compromises the site’s connections and would be difficult to realize.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture shown in the renderings is somewhat generic, but promising professionally speaking.

USABILITY
The layout schemes are clear and rational, albeit schematic. Extensive depth in the new building is likely to result in dark and unpleasant interiors in many areas.

UNIQUENESS
The resulting structure is too homogenous and lacks hierarchy.

ENTRY 093
“37WBR”

USABILITY
The problematic aspects of this design are linked to the immediate surroundings. Space options have been looked at, but are essentially schematic. Dividing activities between separate buildings is not a very well functioning option, even though there are interconnecting spaces under the decks. Orientation underground is never particularly easy.

UNIQUENESS
The design has been prepared with care but is reminiscent more of a shopping centre rather than a learning environment.
ENTRY 094
“CROSS”

GENERAL
Another entry that almost fills the site without forming any meaningful dialogue with the established environment.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITecture
The design appears to prevent, rather than encourage connectivity.

USABILITY
The internal plans have some merit and the intersection of the cross looks promising.

UNiQUENESS
Memorable? No, forgettable.

ENTRY 096
“SMSN”

GENERAL
The design is based on rectangular buildings twisting around light courts. The positioning of the buildings in the surrounding urban structure is not completely successful. The Exhibition Centre is much too close to the Aalto Library. The location and definition of the Central Square is somewhat ambiguous.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The facades of the buildings are quite generic and would need further study to become convincing. Despite its shortcomings, the proposal is worthy of development.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way. The metro station is shown according to the existing plans and could easily be integrated in the new building complex.
ENTRY 097
"193317"

GENERAL
An interesting 2-5 storey pentagon design offering some interesting framed relationships with its surroundings, as well as some inspiring spaces for teaching and studying.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
In order to work with the existing buildings, the apparent bulk of the new building has had to grow disproportionately, resulting in an excessively massive effect seen from the outside. A similar approach has been more successfully resolved in “Surf and Turf”, for example.

USABILITY
The internal planning of the design is somewhat sketchy, but professionally competent.

UNIQUENESS
The unique functionality of the design has been rather negated by its bulk, which does not quite manage to establish a harmonious relationship with its neighbours.

ENTRY 098
"QUAD"

GENERAL
A large-scale, 3-4 storey reinterpretation of the traditional Anglo-American college quadrangle.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The length of the long blocks forming the quadrangle is excessive, but the area forming the new forecourt plaza to the existing main building has quality.

USABILITY
A substantial amount of space is located below ground, lit only by roof lights. The floor plan treatments are fairly conventional.

UNIQUENESS
The use of such a large quadrangle in this context is unique, but its usage would be limited by Finland’s long winters.
GENERAL
The facades of the new building along the edge of the competition area leave a series of squares between them.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The series of squares and park areas is a developable option. One of the building wings, however, cuts off the view and connection from the south-west toward the old library. In terms of scale, the proposal has some merits, but the sloping, cantilevered structures used do not suit the surrounding environment or enter into a dialogue with Alvar Aalto’s buildings.

USABILITY
The buildings have a very vivid design. The spaces bordered by straight and curved walls alternate on the ground floor. On the upper floors, long narrow corridors dominate, however.

UNIQUENESS
The location of the buildings is developable, but the design is unrefined architecturally and replete with diverse ideas.

ENTRY 099
“Edutopia”

ENTRY 101
“Urban Apparatus”

GENERAL
The design is based on a network formed by a consistently high, thick structural mass that cuts off connections and views in the area. In terms of cityscape, the design is monotonous and dreary.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The walkway leading towards the library is brutally cut off. The repetition of similar architectural elements throughout the new buildings feels somewhat monotonous.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way. Connections within the narrow structure are long and difficult.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.
ENTRY 103
"A!meadow"

GENERAL
This is another entry that attempts to solve the urban challenge and complex space requirement with a single large gesture, this time in the form of low, but deep-framed megastructure adapted to its surroundings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new triangular A! meadow in front of the existing main building seems pleasant, but the approach from the north is interrupted by the end of the new building and is difficult to negotiate. The architectural treatment looks promising and the building height is well-tuned to its surroundings.

USABILITY
The deep plan and generous floor heights allow for a variety of floor plan arrangements.

UNIQUENESS
Despite some promising aspects, the entry is not as convincing as some other similar proposals.
ENTRY 104
"HEARTALK"

GENERAL
An unbroken three-storey building featuring a closed, varying arc and framing a spacious, glass-roofed atrium. The building takes up a considerable part of the open space alongside Otaniementie. A square bringing together the different elements is formed between the metro station, the new building, the old library, and the main building. A new building with shops is located opposite the old library, to the southwest.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new building is framed by both square-like spaces and freely flowing landscape spaces between the new and the old buildings. The starting-point is good, but the form of the exterior spaces remains vague. The principal view from northwest towards the former main building has been obstructed. The new building, which resembles a major arena, does not engage in dialogue with Alvar Aalto’s structures.

USABILITY
The interior atrium space could be an interesting solution for bringing the different functions of the school together. Despite their meandering routes, the circular hallways could become monotonous because of their repeating shapes. The spaces within the building feel isolated from the environment and fail to interact with the old buildings.

UNIQUENESS
A carefully executed design that nevertheless feels out of place in the campus setting.
ENTRY 105
"triad"

GENERAL
Centre stage is occupied by a large, semi-inverted triangular building with folded roof surfaces that preserves or frames the site’s key views. The result is a real show-stopper, intended as a new main building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The symbolic intent of the new building is clear, but even with subtle adjustments to its surroundings still represents a massive structure. The architectural treatment is convincing, forming a clear contrast with the existing dominant red-brick architectural language.

USABILITY
The planning of the building has been carried out with great professionalism and verve.

UNIQUENESS
An interesting, but unfortunately somewhat alien addition to the location, reminiscent more of an international art museum than a centre for studying the creative arts.

ENTRY 106
"PATHWAY"

GENERAL
One of the least successful of this type of solution, due to its inability to respond to the changing circumstances along its length.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The entry is beautifully presented and the views are highly evocative.
The idea of this design is a very long and narrow portico along the south-east – north-west axis, consisting primarily of a corridor of pillars with wooden structures. Different spaces are grouped along and top of this corridor, including media space. The arched forms add variety to the linear structure. A series of squares acts as a transverse motif, starting from the metro station and continuing to the front of the former main building.

The design has a strong overall feel. Although the portico provides some compliment to Alvar Aalto’s building, the new building protrudes too close to the front of the old library. The views from the south-west have been cut off. The treatment is rough and the portico is somewhat ill-judged in terms of its scale.

This proposal works pretty well in the urban structure, and the key connections and views are preserved. The massing of the buildings has not been as successful, however.

The architecture is too bland and anonymous to be a vivid addition to the existing campus. The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.

The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way. The floor plans are schematic.

The buildings are essentially undeveloped as presented and the thinking behind them is not explained.

GENERAL

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE

USABILITY

UNIQUENESS

GENERAL

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE

USABILITY

UNIQUENESS
**ENTRY 111**

"**AVEA!**"

**GENERAL**
The Aalto ARTS Building consists of a group of ellipsoids and a roofed space between them.

**URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE**
From an urban structure perspective, the Aalto ARTS Building is well-located. In cityscape terms, however, the design’s relationship to Otaniemi is unclear – wooden buildings with curvy walls are difficult to justify here.

**USABILITY**
Although the layout drawings are sketchy, they demonstrate that forcing the space requirement into ellipsoid-based buildings has caused problems.

**USABILITY**
In a long building, functions can end up being far from each other. The portico does not necessarily follow the most important passages in the area. Roof cultivation could be an interesting additional option, but obviously would require maintenance.

**UNIQUENESS**
An original basic option, which has remained at the schematic level in many respects.
GENERAL
The design is based on two massive, intersecting city blocks. Their scale is too large for the site and they represent a problem for the site’s connections and views.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture is unsurprising and offers a zero thrill factor – there is too much repetition.

USABILITY
The concept is contrived and leads to functional problems within the buildings. The distances are long and dreary inside the buildings.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.

ENTRY 112
"Aalto Clover Loop"

GENERAL
This design is based on four two- to three-storey buildings connected underground by a square. The buildings cover a substantial part of the competition area and have been ‘landscaped’ using extensive green roofs.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Gradually ascending green roofs form the principal theme of this design. The wells between them form a network of streets and squares, which also provides views towards the former main building. The view from the southwest towards the old library has been left as an open landscape.

USABILITY
Dividing the space between four separate buildings makes internal communication challenging. Connecting areas can be found on the floor below the current ground level, where most of the space is implemented. Locating restaurants and other shared facilities on the underground floor with
restricted views and limited lighting, however, is not a very promising starting-point. Providing sufficient daylight for the facilities located under the green roofs would require further investigation. The green roofs may be functional as recreational spaces, but maintaining them on the scale required would be challenging. Building in stages and establishing sufficient internal flexibility is also likely to prove difficult.

UNIQUENESS
The design has been executed on its own terms. Its architectural appearance is largely based on the green roofs, which are designed to function as extensions of the existing landscape. An architectural dialogue with the existing buildings has been partly eliminated as a result. A new centre for arts studies calls for a clearer, more prominent architectural style to create an inspiring learning environment.

GENERAL
The Aalto ARTS Building in this design is based on zone that delimits a large paved piazza on the west side of the main building designed by Alvar Aalto. The concept is clear and well thought-out in terms of urban structure. The site’s connections and views from the west are problematic, however.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The piazza is too wide to act as an active urban space and meeting point. All the same, the design has development potential. The buildings are presented in a very sketchy and unsurprising way, however.

USABILITY
The layout schemes are also rather sketchy. A spatial hierarchy is missing and the main entrance is difficult to find. The connection to the metro station is excessively long. The new structure located across from the library is well thought-out.
GENERAL
The designer of this entry has placed numerous three- to four-storey buildings near the edges of the competition area. These are connected by an extensive network of underground facilities intended to reduce the visible volume of the buildings required to accommodate the large space requirement. Access to facilities beneath the green-roofed courtyard level has been implemented using a complicated system of roofed ramps.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Despite the apparent professionalism behind the entry, the designers have totally misunderstood both the context and the requirements of the competition programme. The scheme competes with and dominates Alvar Aalto’s existing milieu in a very arrogant fashion.

USABILITY
The buildings are too far apart from each other to create ideal conditions for encouraging collaboration and synergy between different disciplines and departments.
proposed buildings are essentially heterogeneous. The row of cube-like houses along the southwest corner of the area is schematic, even down to the facades shown.

USABILITY
Deploying the space requirement across a wide area brings with it certain practical problems, including navigation within the area. The mechanically repeated row of cube-like houses offers limited opportunities for internal flexibility or functional versatility. Maintaining the green courtyard levels would also be challenging on this scale.

UNIQUENESS
The emphasis on spaciousness evident in the design is commendable, but has resulted in a solution that remains vague in terms of both landscape and architecture.

ENTRY 119
"future"

GENERAL
Large, streamlined building masses occupy the open spaces of the competition area almost completely.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
This design does not provide any interesting square or landscape spaces. The new buildings, with their strong forms, come too close to and almost touch the former main building and library. The plan does not take the views into account either; although narrow sightlines have been maintained towards the auditorium section of the former main building and towards the library.

USABILITY
The location of the spaces in the building has been partially illustrated in the floor plans. It is not, however, possible to gain a real grasp of the functionality of the spaces. Long rows of rooms, some near narrow light wells, are not a good starting-point. The common spaces, on the other hand, are far more vivid.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal clearly tends to create new and startling architecture. It does not relate in any way to the location, however, or to the design potential offered by the campus.
ENTRY 122  
"SOLIPSISM"

GENERAL  
The Aalto ARTS Building in this design consists of a long structure, partially elevated off the ground, that is over-sized in terms of the surrounding urban structure. The beam-like building cuts off views to the south-west and west.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE  
The architecture is dreary and offers no ‘thrill factor’.

USABILITY  
The form of the building results in long internal distances and non-functional interior space.

ENTRY 123  
"gmjeap"

GENERAL  
A spatially confusing proposal that offers little additional value to the existing location.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE  
The architecture of the new volumes is dull and uninspiring.

USABILITY  
The covering of most of the external space with a giant glazed roof structure is highly questionable and the value of doing so is debatable.
ENTRY 124
"CONNECTIVITY"

**GENERAL**
This design consists of a low-lying structure reminiscent of a compact city or a kasbah. The proposal is interesting, but too sketchy to be convincing.

**URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE**
The orientation of the streets cutting through the design is not completely successful with regard to the site’s connections and views. Part of the buildings comes too close to Alvar Aalto’s structures.

**USABILITY**
The architecture is unsurprising and the layouts schematic.

**UNIQUENESS**
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.

ENTRY 126
"HARBOR"

**GENERAL**
This proposal comprises three rectangular buildings that are interlocked and provided with glass-roofed central spaces. There is an extensive square on the north-western side of the former main building. Free landscape area is left on the south-western side of the old library. A smaller additional building has also been sketched in this area.

**URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE**
A new, fairly low group of buildings accompanies the former main building around a large square. The views and routes from further north-west are cut off by a building, however, although people can pass through the new central hall. This grouping of buildings does not produce a very natural square or landscape spaces. The architectural expression of the new buildings is fairly mute.

**USABILITY**
The grouping of the spaces is schematic. The orientation between the spaces lacks a natural feel.

**UNIQUENESS**
A restrained proposal that does not contain any particular developable options in terms of the location or architectural expression.
GENERAL
In principle, this design represents a sound urban strategy for the context, but the division of space into separate buildings has not yielded any clear advantages.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Architecturally, the design is relaxed and offers a serene and calm backdrop for the building’s functions area. The scale of the entry is well-handled.

USABILITY
The design of the internal space is professional, but lacks any innovative ideas or an inspiring ambience.

UNIQUENESS
A competent, but not particularly memorable design.

ENTRY 128
"270685"

GENERAL
The composition of the beam-like buildings is overdimensioned and pretentious in terms of the site’s urban context.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal is sketchy and difficult to read.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications have been shown in only a very elementary way. Narrow rectangular forms result in long, monotonous corridors, long distances between facilities, and ordinary-looking floor plans.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.
GENERAL
The edges of the site on both sides of Otaniementie are framed by comb-like, zigzag-shaped buildings connected by a steep, hilly artificial terrain with embedded openings and various connecting facilities underneath. A convex-walled new building in a different architectural idiom has been placed opposite the old library (southwest).

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The aim of retaining the open views towards the former main building and the library, and creating a shared external space between the new wings and the entrance of the former main building, are positive starting-points. The shaped terrain and the edges of the buildings certainly succeed in creating spaces that feel dynamic and spirited, and interesting. The design’s overall architectural touch remains vague, however. The artificial hills and the openings made in them feel too accentuated near Alvar Aalto’s main building and in the campus landscape on the whole.

USABILITY
The distribution of the space across a wide area creates long distances and challenging navigation within the facilities. Maintaining the green roofs would also be challenging, considering the extent to which they can be used as extensions of the area’s external spaces.

UNIQUENESS
A very interesting design in its own way, but the designer has been unable to retain complete control over the themes. The proposed shaping of the terrain stands out too prominently from the existing environment to offer a positive contribution to the Otaniemi campus.
ENTRY 132
"CREATIVE LANDSCAPE"

GENERAL
The low-lying landscaped structure with a green roof in this design is interesting. The scale of the building is a failure, however. The very extensive structure compromises the site’s connections and views.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal has been presented in a professional manner. The extremely long glass facades would have benefited from some variation.

USABILITY
The immense depth of the frame reduces the usability of the building. The extensive nature of the structure also makes it inefficient and costly and difficult to realize. The internal connections within the building are too long.

UNIQUENESS
The design features a number of common spaces that could facilitate spontaneous interaction among the building’s users. Varying the height of the building mass would have made the proposal more interesting and perhaps better functioning.

ENTRY 133
"SIBELIUS"

GENERAL
This design consists of a massive main building block and a low podium with a green roof, linked by a wide central square between them.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
An undeveloped proposal in terms of the local cityscape and structure. The central square is too large. The massive size of the main building is also a problem, as is the fact that it is closed on all sides except the central square.

USABILITY
Wide spaces with green roofs are expensive.

UNIQUENESS
The proposed architecture is dull and lacks personality.
ENTRY 134
"BASHO"

GENERAL
The elongated, partly comb-like building that houses the main facilities of the new school in this design is located on the edge of the competition area, southwest of Otaniementie. Restaurants and other facilities are located in another, smaller building northeast of the road. The buildings are linked by a spacious green area that becomes a square in front of the former main building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The positioning of the buildings and the spacious landscape are natural and good starting-points. The principal views towards the former main building and the library have been taken into account very well. Numerous exterior views from inside the new building utilise the environment in a commendable way. The scale of the new buildings is appropriate as well. The facades and roofs, however, are based on relatively monotonous green structures.

The actual appearance of the facades has been eliminated to some extent, and no real dialogue has been established between the new facades and the old buildings.

USABILITY
The way the different functions are deployed has clearly been considered by the designer. The main entrance is located very effectively near the entrance to the metro station. The restaurants in the other building open in the right direction, but are left slightly isolated from the school’s other functions.

UNIQUENESS
Although a developable solution with some sound starting-points, the overall architectural style of the design feels undeveloped. The appearance of the facades relies too much on green walls, which are very popular at the moment.
GENERAL
Too much of this design almost fills the entire site and only succeeds in threatening the existing buildings nearby. The designers have misunderstood the instructions regarding the existing road system, which has resulted in heavy and suspect infrastructure solutions.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architectural language is alien to the context.

USABILITY
The internal planning of the design is dull and conventional.

GENERAL
The extensive comb-like structure of uniform height is somewhat flat within the cityscape and its scale is too large for the urban structure. The glass-roofed interior street does not compensate for the external connection and the views from the west.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture is monotonous and the layouts schematic. The square seems over-large, but could easily be articulated or landscaped with more greenery.

USABILITY
The form of the building results in long distances and non-functional inner space. The metro station is shown according to the existing plans and could easily be integrated in the new building complex.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.
ENTRY 138
"271089"

GENERAL
An elegantly and clearly presented entry, which envisages the new Aalto ARTS Building as a prominent cluster of individual towers linked by a one-storey, deep-plan podium and additional basement levels. The commercial facilities are located in a separate building, together with the metro station.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The cluster arrangement, although workable, cuts off visual and spatial contact with the existing auditorium, seen from the northern approach. Despite creating an interesting sequence of new public external spaces, the scale of the highest tower and the commercial block is too massive and dominating for this context.

USABILITY
The design’s internal planning is competent, but not particularly inspiring and needs further development.

UNIQUENESS
A promising starting-point has unfortunately led to an overtly massive end-result, more reminiscent of a business park than a dynamic and innovative academic centre for the creative arts.

ENTRY 139
"a loop for learning"

GENERAL
A winding circle of multi-storey buildings elevated on high pedestals. It appears to be located on the south-western edge of the competition area and curves above VTT’s old buildings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The plan has been made based on various analyses, but the basic solution remains difficult to perceive. The building does not spring from the characteristics of the site nor does the design take Alvar Aalto’s buildings into account.

USABILITY
It is difficult to achieve reasonable links between the environment and the new building or within the different floors of the building or between its groups of space. The space appears to have been scattered along the tracks created by the building’s floors.

UNIQUENESS
The intention seems to have been to create a futuristic structure. The proposal remains a fantasy, however, and one that cannot be developed into an executable form.
ENTRY 141
"Factory Wonderland"

GENERAL
This proposal is based on three separate buildings, of which the Aalto ARTS Building is the largest. The design for Lume, which was not required in the competition programme, seems to be the most interesting.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Lume is located where the Aalto ARTS Building should have been placed with regard to the site’s connections and views. The design includes a lot of unclear and largely unattractive space.

USABILITY
The layouts are schematic and sketchy in places, despite the accuracy of the presentation.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.

ENTRY 143
"URBAN DRIFT"

GENERAL
A totally unconvincing and banal offering of high-rise, overpowering towers designed to create something new and ‘memorable’ – architectural arrogance at its worst.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The 3D aerial view is clearly drawn to the wrong scale and exaggerates the high-rise aspect even more than the other visual material. The new central square appears cold and unattractive. The entire ensemble relegates the main library and existing main building to secondary roles in the cityscape.

USABILITY
The internal planning of the design has potential and the sections offer some interesting spatial interaction. The designer’s professionalism is apparent in the architectural treatment of the complex.

UNIQUENESS
Relying on height and bulk for impact has led to a totally unconvincing end result.
ENTRY 144

"HABITABLE NATURE"

GENERAL
The plan is based on two fairly low, but rather long tentacle-like buildings, which contain pointy transverse wings. The building spreads its wings over most of the competition area.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The buildings break up the existing open landscape area into strips of various forms. There are no interconnecting outdoor spaces. The buildings do not – with the exception of their height perhaps – take into account the former main building and library; instead, they almost touch them.

USABILITY
Space has been located along the long corridors and transverse spikes, but not in any functional manner. The distances are long and there are no interconnecting common spaces.

UNIQUENESS
A few interesting views can be seen in the perspective drawings. In other respects, the proposal is undeveloped and the overall feeling is strange given the environment for which it is intended.

ENTRY 145

"Catalog_800"

GENERAL
The large building masses in this design delimit the park-like environment and a sunken piazza. The composition is weakly based in terms of the urban structure and cityscape.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture of the buildings is rather ordinary.

USABILITY
The layouts are schematic and due to the long building frames they function rather awkwardly. The layout drawings are presented beautifully and clearly, however.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.
GENERAL
This design is based on long, narrow, parallelepiped-shaped buildings grouped on both sides of Otaniementie linked by a square bringing various functions together. Some elements of the space requirement are implemented as underground facilities below the square.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The grouping of the different buildings is very clear. The views towards the former main building and the library have been taken into account. The shapes of the square and the buildings that frame it, however, are not very captivating. The different levels of the square have been designed to establish connections and provide sunlight for the various facilities, but the structure appears fragmentary. The square in front of the former main building is clear-cut, but the other exterior spaces lack a landscaping touch that would unite the elements.

The elongated brick-clad buildings form excellent companions to the workshops and laboratory buildings that accompany the former main building. The new Arts Building calls for a more compelling and independent appearance, however.

USABILITY
The space plan is presented very schematically, making it difficult to evaluate. Deploying the space required into so many separate sections is not a very functional solution. The narrow office block-like wings may be functional, but many of the shared facilities that connect them on the ground floor are below courtyard level and will not receive sufficient daylight.

The media centre has been located in an unrealistically low underground space below the courtyard. Connectivity between the metro and the new underground facilities is natural, but mobility in other directions is more challenging.

UNIQUENESS
The principal starting-points of the design – a shared green square and a green area framed by the wings of the buildings – are developable solutions, but are relatively unrefined.
ENTRY 147
"Space_tracking_lightning"

GENERAL
An over-complex and ultimately confusing design that adds very little of merit to the site.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The design’s best offering lies in the shape and extent of the new public spaces. The new extension straddling the VTT complex is a serious mistake.

USABILITY
It is difficult to assess the quality of the planning, which seems over-contrived, confusing, and lacking in clarity.

ENTRY 148
"PUBLICSPHERE"

GENERAL
The main structure has been placed in a central location on the south-western side of Otaniementie. One wing protrudes towards the front of the old library. The resulting outdoor spaces have not been analyzed: Are they squares or landscape?

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
A central location on the south-western side of the area is a good starting-point. The building in front of the old library cuts off the old tree-lined avenue and the view opening from it, however. The new buildings do not engage in any particular dialogue with Alvar Aalto’s buildings. The long row of buildings and the repeated forms are heavy in terms of their scale.

USABILITY
The bottom-floor solutions of the buildings have been analyzed, but the long corridor views are unlikely to create a positive learning environment.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal has been developed with care, and its disposition and compact basic solution have developable qualities. From an architectural point of view, the proposal appears heavy, however, and its design language is similar to that of a large office complex.
ENTRY 149
"Learning Curves"

GENERAL
This design offers an interesting park-like environment. The location of the buildings in the urban structure is problematic, however, as they complicate the site’s connections and views from the west towards the campus area. A closer location to the metro station would have improved the situation.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture of the buildings is interesting and courageous. In terms of scale, the buildings seem a little too large and are not tied into the existing buildings. The buildings extend over a large area and there is no space for other construction in the same way as there is in the best proposals.

USABILITY
The connection to the metro station is not the best possible. The station is shown according to the existing plans and could be easily integrated in the new building complex. The layouts are rather schematic, but developable.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal is interesting, but its integration with the urban structure is not successful.

ENTRY 151
"CAMPUSCAMP 2015"

GENERAL
A vigorous addition to the campus, highlighted by a fine new square but marred by the decision to locate shops and restaurants directly in front of the existing main building and the main library.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new square and its mixture of low and high structures feels appropriate.

USABILITY
The parallel placement of the school’s various departments in relationship to each other and linked by a series of wide bridging spaces is an interesting idea worth developing. The general spatial arrangements include a high proportion of generic space, offering extensive opportunities for varying how it is used.

UNIQUENESS
An interesting starting-point, which would have been more convincing without the unnecessary additions placed around the older buildings.
ENTRY 152
"UBUNTU"

GENERAL
The proposal consists of a comb-like Aalto ARTS Building and low-lying buildings that sometimes come too close to Alvar Aalto’s buildings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The design creates some interesting, different outdoor spaces around and inside the site. Street-level views are promising.

USABILITY
The lay-out schemes are developable.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.

ENTRY 154
"YLÖS"

GENERAL
A series of fairly low, anonymous, free-standing buildings connected by a large underground series of spaces fail to inject the site with any substantial extra value.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The urban spaces are too similar in size and nature, lacking a clear idea of their relative importance.

USABILITY
The internal planning of the buildings is competent, but dull.

UNIQUENESS
There is a general lack of uniqueness and ambition in the design.
ENTRY 155
"LIVING CAMPUS"

GENERAL
The Aalto ARTS Building consists of an E-shaped high building mass and an extensive low section open towards the west. The structure turns its back on the former main building, which is not a good solution.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new building volumes come too close to the old ones in some places. With regard to the cityscape, the design is inappropriate for Otaniemi. The architecture does not sit well with Otaniemi’s campus environment.

USABILITY
The piazzas below street level weaken the design’s functionality.

UNIQUENESS
The design’s biggest shortcoming is its relationship with the existing urban structure.

ENTRY 157
"halkeamia"

GENERAL
The proposal is based on premises located below the existing ground level. The above-ground buildings are boulder-like pieces that seem disconnected to the red-brick milieu of the Otaniemi campus.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The proposal is skilfully prepared, but rather sketchy.

USABILITY
The extensive underground space is unrealistic technically and economically, and they are not justified in terms of the site’s cityscape or functional needs. The site’s above-ground connections are compromised and the atmosphere in the underground space seems unlikely to be particularly welcoming.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment of the design needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.
ENTRY 158
"2y"

GENERAL
An interesting juxtaposition of new elements, forming an attractive new main plaza.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The diagonal cross mass of the western building is at odds with the relative unforced natural quality of the rest of the design. The easternmost block needs adjustment, as it blocks the vista to the main auditorium.

USABILITY
The massing principle formation lends itself easily to providing various sizes of teaching space, consisting of both narrow- and deep-framed elements.

UNIQUENESS
Although not the most unique of solutions, it has qualities that provide added value to the context.

ENTRY 159
"lumihiutaleet"

GENERAL
A highly artificial and formalist proposal that features a series of rather uninteresting spaces, creates difficulties in terms of connectivity between departments and interrupts some vistas.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The urban space in front of the library and main building is too large. The raised blocks create rather unpleasant covered spaces, with a negative microclimate in the winter.

USABILITY
There is insufficient connectivity and too little generic, inspiring internal space.

UNIQUENESS
The design is reminiscent of an over-large and clumsy meccano construction kit rather than the snow flakes of the entry’s name. The metaphor simply does not translate into a convincing design.
GENERAL
This design divides the new facilities into two principal groups of buildings, the larger of which is located northwest of the former main building and the smaller southwest of Otaniementie. A partly landscaped, square space is left between the new and the old buildings and houses various smaller pavilions.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The location of the buildings is not successful. The principal view from the northwest towards the former main building has been obstructed. The largest of the new structures intrude into the foreground of the main building in a way that feels oppressive. The view from the southwest towards the old library has been left open. The open spaces left between the buildings are fragmented; no square has been created to bring the site’s functions together or to have a freely flowing landscape space.

The relationship between the new buildings and the existing Alvar Aalto buildings is left vague and no spatial dialogue results. The organisation of the new buildings and their distribution into sections on a smaller scale has its merits.

USABILITY
The spatial distribution of different learning facilities into higher and lower spaces and a connecting atrium is a good starting-point, as is the distribution of space into smaller units. Dividing the facilities into two principal categories, however, is not so successful. The commercial facilities and restaurants have been located on the ground level, together with the learning facilities. These partly ‘external’ spaces occupy the entire first floor, which is probably unrealistic.

UNIQUENESS
A thoroughly studied architectural entity that has been implemented relatively carefully based on its own starting-points. The positioning of the buildings and placing large-volume structures so close to the northwest side of the former main building, however, do not create a solid base for development.
ENTRY 161

"Avalon"

GENERAL
This design features a line of curving buildings that form an enclosing circle framing a central square.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The low building tends to merge into the landscape. The circle of buildings curves very close to the former main building and closes views towards it.

USABILITY
The circle of buildings is fairly closed and the potential for creating interaction and contacts between the building spaces and other campus areas remains unused. The space solutions have remained essentially schematic.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal features a series of framing proposals but remains largely suggestive.

ENTRY 162

"MISSING PUZZLE"

GENERAL
Another triangular building complex placed in the very centre of the site, albeit a lighter and more elegant architectural starting-point than the others.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The lightness and relative size of the volumes raise doubts about the ability of the design to meet the specified space requirements.

USABILITY
The internal spatial planning seems haphazard and conventional, lacking in the ability to generate inspiring spaces for teaching and studying.
ENTRY 163
“Purple Chicken”

GENERAL
The proposal is based on an unsuccessful urban structural analysis. As a result, the new structure is placed in an unfavourable location in the competition area. The large-scale Aalto ARTS Building is in an awkward position with regard to the site’s views.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Lume (?) is located close to Alvar Aalto’s main building and library, which is a problematic in terms of the site’s cityscape and connections.

USABILITY
The proposal is sketchy. The architecture proposed and its layouts are schematic and lack imagination.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.

ENTRY 164
“ASTERISKI”

GENERAL
A large star-shaped mass divides the competition area into several park-like parts in this design. The solution is problematic in terms of urban structure; the site’s connections and views to the west are also affected.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new massive landscaped structure and entry plaza do not function on a similar scale to Alvar Aalto’s buildings. The design seems over-dimensioned and ineffective.

USABILITY
The layouts are schematic and generic.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal is skilfully presented and the architecture is interesting and courageous in places.
GENERAL
A potpourri of intertwining, framing buildings occupies the open area on the north-western side of the former main building. Open landscape space is left along the edges and in front of the old library, which is not analyzed further in the proposal.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The solution blocks the views from the north-west toward the former main building. The solution does not have any particularly well thought-out relationship with the site and the old Alvar Aalto buildings. The new buildings have the feel of public structures.

USABILITY
The centralised space solutions could be functional. Flexibility and expandability would be more difficult to implement, however.

UNIQUENESS
The design of the buildings is controlled, but in terms of how the structures have been placed on the site the proposal does not offer any developable options.

ENTRY 166
"CROSS STICH"

GENERAL
The proposal is based on intersecting buildings that seem to be located somewhat haphazardly and in a way that is unfavourable in terms of the urban structure, negatively impacting the site’s views and connections.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture feels pretentious and disconnected in relation to the buildings designed by Aalto for the existing campus.

USABILITY
The floor plans are schematic and generic. The building’s form results in long distances and non-functional interior spaces.

UNIQUENESS
The architectural treatment needs further study and should be developed in a more personable way.
ENTRY 167
"AGNITIO"

GENERAL
A clumsy offering that fills the intersection, creating some nondescript leftover spaces between the new and existing buildings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architectural treatment is heavy and oppressive.

ENTRY 169
"OPEN HOUSE"

GENERAL
A cubist composition, very reminiscent of Herman Hertzberger’s early workplace schemes.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The general urban plan has some positive qualities, but although the facades look promising the overall architectural treatment seems dull and uninspired.

USABILITY
The general planning model is flexible and produces a sympathetic environment. The departments are relatively close to each another, which would facilitate collaborative work and the spaces between them would provide a pleasant microclimate.

UNIQUENESS
The entry is unnecessarily reticent and cautious, but contains some potentially interesting ideas.
ENTRY 170

"466111"

GENERAL
The new facilities are located in two almost square buildings that frame courtyards or shared facilities and are positioned in a row northwest of the former main building. One of the two buildings also houses the LUME Media Centre. Another narrower zigzag-shaped building frames the old buildings southwest of the old Otaniemi road. The new narrow building houses commercial premises. A square is created in the foreground of the old library and the administration wing of the main building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new, bigger buildings occupy most of the open landscape northwest of the former main building. The dominant auditorium section of the former main building is cropped out of the view. The view from the southwest to the old library, on the other hand, has been left unobstructed. Landscape space between the buildings has been eliminated almost completely. The square between the new metro station and the old library has a clear shape and its scale is appropriate. In general, however, the relationship between the architectural style of the design and the old buildings is not very captivating. The ramp in front of the old library also disrupts the view.

USABILITY
Dividing the facilities into three separate main structures does not provide very good opportunities for interaction. The connection from the metro station to the square and towards the buildings is well thought-out. Commercial facilities are positioned strategically near the entrance to the metro.

UNIQUENESS
The positioning of the building reflects something of a personal touch. The market square leading northeast from the metro entrance towards the new and the old buildings has its merits. The other possibilities for creating a positive landscape space, however, are lost. The design of the new buildings feels considered and their scale is appropriate, but their relationship to the old Alvar Aalto’s buildings is vague. No dialogue between the old and the new results.
ENTRY 171
"HELMI"

GENERAL
This design features a building complex covered by wavy roofs and an artificial landscape, which appears to occupy the area north-west of the former main building almost completely. The new premises are intertwined in an interesting, but difficult way.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The building forms its own, exciting world, but it does not have any positive relationship with the site and the old buildings. It remains unclear how the front of the former main building has been handled. The cross-sections and perspective drawings show that flowing spaces can create exciting interiors.

USABILITY
Various space groups have been indicated in the floor plans and schemes. How functional internal traffic would be remains hard to judge, however.

UNIQUENESS
An architectural fantasy with some futuristic qualities, but difficult to develop as a response to the objectives set for the site.

ENTRY 172
"CONNECTING TOPOGRAPHY"

GENERAL
The proposal is based on new buildings with a floor structure in the shape of the letter U; the urban space left in between seems somewhat unspecified. The general plan fits well with the urban structure, and the site’s connections and views are not compromised.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture lacks imagination and is repetitive. Its relationship to Alvar Aalto’s buildings seems strange and detached.

USABILITY
The floor plans are schematic and generic.

UNIQUENESS
Some views and some aspects of the atmosphere look promising.
ENTRY 173
"THE HUG"

GENERAL
This design of three partially overlapping building masses seems over-dimensioned and artificial and disrupts the site’s connections and views.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Some parts of the new building volumes come too close to the old ones. The proposal is skilfully prepared, especially the renderings. The architecture is interesting, but not very original. The materials have been well adapted to the Otaniemi campus environment.

USABILITY
The floor plans are sketchy, but developable.

UNIQUENESS
The biggest problem with the design lies in its scale and relationship to the existing urban structure.

ENTRY 174
"173ota"

GENERAL
This entry recalls some of the pioneering projects emanating from Spain and Japan, but in this context the cylindrical gesture is too grand for the space available, despite its low height.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The treatment of the ground surface opens up some interesting possibilities for encouraging new outdoor events and activities.

USABILITY
Internally, the spatial arrangements are inspiring and could be varied to suit many different needs.

UNIQUENESS
A truly unique offering that would need to be reduced in size to be compatible with its surroundings.
ENTRY 175
"SPECTRUM"

GENERAL
This proposal presents a central, round, glass-roofed square, connected to a group of rectangular buildings that frame various small yards. The buildings are located immediately to the front of the former main building and library, on their south-western and southern side.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The location of the buildings breaks up the open landscape and ‘fills it in’ to a large extent. The view toward the auditorium of the former main building from the north-west has been retained, but the view from the south-west toward the library and main building has been cut off. The relationship with Alvar Aalto’s buildings and the old campus landscape has not been taken into account, both with regards to the location of the buildings and their architectural expression.

USABILITY
A round covered square can act as an interconnecting space, but the other solutions proposed are essentially schematic.

UNIQUENESS
The perspective drawings show some vivid views of the environment, but the basic design, and the proposed location in particular, do not provide a developable option.
ENTRY 177
"ANNE OF CLEVES"

GENERAL
This proposal is based on several separate buildings that have a haphazard relationship to the existing urban structure. The Aalto ARTS Building itself is immense.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture is original and unique, but its links to that of the rest of Otaniemi seem distant.

USABILITY
The layouts are schematic and dreary – there is too much repetition and the spatial hierarchy does not work.

UNIQUENESS
The pools and accompanying saunas in front of the Aalto ARTS Building seem pretentious for a central public space in Otaniemi.

ENTRY 178
"ICON"

GENERAL
The scheme recalls an overlarge and clumsy mecano construction kit. The chosen metaphor simply does not translate into a convincing scheme.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The inclusion of a small tower forms a fine counterpoint to Aalto’s original auditorium. There is an almost Italianate flavour to the architecture and spatial ideas, recalling some projects of the 1930s.

USABILITY
The strategy lends itself to forming a variety of both fixed and flexible spaces: the example shown reveals the author’s professional competence. However the distances between facilities internally are excessive.

UNIQUENESS
A pleasing, but self-effacing entry.
GENERAL
The new buildings here have been divided into groups of low, principally two-storey lean-to-roofed structures in a village-like formation spread across most of the competition area and connected by walkway-like spaces. Squares bringing the various elements together are positioned in the foreground of the former main building and the library. The Arts Building and some of the VTT extension buildings are located in the western part of the site, while the southwest part in front of the old library has been designated for the Learning Centre and Media.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The low, field-like groups of new buildings could form interesting courtyard spaces and alleys, and the low vertical scale enables the former main building to retain its dominant role. No effort is made, however, to take the old buildings into account in any other way. The views from the northwest towards the former main building and from the southwest towards the library have been blocked. The new buildings push into the area northwest of the former main building and come too close to it. If the new buildings are given a supporting role in relation to the old buildings, the new circular buildings and the embedded landscape elements assume too dominant a role in the foreground of the old buildings. The intended architectural appearance of the new buildings is hard to grasp from the design.

USABILITY
The distribution of buildings as proposed in the design undermines the establishment of good internal connections and makes navigation more difficult. As such, however, the structural model offers variety, flexibility, and good opportunities for phased construction. Although thought has been given to the different facilities in the ground plan, how internal traffic flows are to be organised remains unclear.

UNIQUENESS
The low, village-like layout of the new buildings may provide an interesting point of departure. The exterior spaces between the buildings, however, are fragmented; no squares or landscape spaces that would bring functions together are provided. The overall architectural appearance of the design also remains unclear.
ENTRY 180
"NOUVELLE VAGUE"

GENERAL
The urban spaces formed by the main wedge-shaped building edges are sympathetic in scale. The main buildings are flanked by two main spatial sequences, one park-like in nature and the other more urban in character, offering pleasant alternative routes for pedestrians. The theme is continued internally: the use of a double grid to form distinct, but connected departments is justified.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
Large concentrations of existing trees are preserved by carefully orienting the main building volumes. The proportions of the main square are sympathetic, but the separate film department building unduly encroaches on the space around the main auditorium. The architectural treatment remains unusually vague and sketchy.

USABILITY
The internal planning principles seem competent, but do not promise a particularly inspiring study and working environment. The location of the outside auditorium seems arbitrary. The scheme relies on underground connections and the internal link to the new metro station is unconvincing.

UNIQUENESS
At an urban design level, the entry has potential, but is not particularly memorable in its present form.
ENTRY 181
"OCULUS"

GENERAL
An extensive light court with gardens and an auditorium are placed in the middle of a gigantic cylindrical building. The building itself is attractive, but its relationship to the existing environment is problematic. The space outside the cylinder is unclear, and the desired urban space is unformed. Alvar Aalto’s buildings are left to play a supportive role.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture is professional, but a little too ethereal and suggestive.

USABILITY
The layouts have been presented in a sketchy and offhand manner. Additional construction is presented skilfully. Some of the commercial premises are too far from the metro station.

UNIQUENESS
The renderings have been made with soul and a lot of skill. Some views and the atmosphere looks promising.

ENTRY 182
"laterna magica"

GENERAL
An intriguing entry that bisects the campus to form a via Arte, onto which the new school opens out.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The new building interrupts the line of the existing avenue of lime trees, but this mistake can be rectified. The architectural treatment is respectful and calm, but succeeds in creating its own distinct character.

USABILITY
Internal planning is slightly hampered by some long corridors, but otherwise appears natural on the basis of the sketchy diagrams.

UNIQUENESS
The restrained and elegant approach that has been adopted is still too sketchy at this stage and would need further refinement and some reconsideration before it could be considered totally convincing.
ENTRY 183

"PASSAGE, COURTYARD, UNDERGROUND."

GENERAL
The new Aalto ARTS Building is split into two twin, low, and massively deep-plan blocks that owe more to office building and business park architecture than to creating a high-quality future centre for the creative arts.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The passage between the buildings redirects pedestrians towards the new metro station area; this ignores the importance of the views linked to the main building’s auditorium. The elevated square creates some unattractive underpasses and unresolved junctions with the new buildings. The square does not have a natural relationship with the original main building.

USABILITY
The design’s internal planning has some potential, but the spatial approach is dull and recalls landscape offices of the 1970s.

UNIQUENESS
A totally unconvincing end result.
ENTRY 184
"TENTWENTY"

GENERAL
The stated starting-point of this design is to create a more urban Otaniemi, and the design extends beyond the competition area. A chain of new buildings is set into the open spaces between the old buildings. The great, open landscape northwest of the former main building is occupied by a large, machine-like building. New buildings have also been positioned on the southwest edge of the open space and opposite the old library. A new architectural highlight – a building which would include Lume – is located at the crossroads of the new square-like spaces in front of the old library and the main building.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The design defines a series of exterior spaces and squares, but their relationship with the campus’ old buildings is not successful. The former main building and, to some extent the library as well, are assigned supporting roles. The new Arts Building is a large-scale, machine-like formation of structures. The shapes of the new architectural highlight, a graded tower which houses the Lume Media Centre, feel out of place considering the location and the environment.

USABILITY
The spatial arrangement within the buildings has been studied very carefully. Basing the Arts Building on relatively mechanical repetition hardly provides a good starting-point for versatility and change, however. The facilities do not feel very inviting. The dense urban centre created near the new metro station has some merits.

UNIQUENESS
The design is carefully considered and its solutions are well-reasoned. Potentially interesting development sites outside the competition area have also been highlighted. The numerous new buildings in the actual competition area, however, eclipse the old buildings and no fruitful dialogue with the old buildings results. The possibilities of the landscape have also been left unused. The new Aalto ARTS Building does not feel like an inspiring learning environment.
ENTRY 185
"K-Piazza"

GENERAL
New buildings frame a new large square, which is partly dropped to a lower level and located on the north-western side of the former main building. An elevated box-like building combines the buildings at a higher level. A smaller building has been placed immediately in front of the old library.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
New buildings and a square linking them occupy much of the western part of the competition area. The new square has a very rigid form, however, with no natural landscape spaces. Although the new square is monumental, it does not take into account the former main building and its auditorium is left out of the views. The entrance to the new square from the north-west, through a gate motif formed by the elevated building, is oversized. The building next to the library extends quite close to this old building. The relationship with the site and Alvar Aalto’s buildings is not a successful one.

USABILITY
The location of the spaces has been thought through, but the routes between the buildings and in the internal areas feel artificial and are unlikely to facilitate people’s orientation.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal includes numerous different ideas, but the thinking behind how the buildings are located does not provide any development opportunities.
ENTRY 186
"URBAN HUB"

GENERAL
This design is based on circular structures located in a way that obstructs traffic and the site’s views.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture is innovative and exceptional, but its relationship with Otaniemi’s other architecture is based on repetition and variations of the shape of Alvar Aalto’s auditorium.

USABILITY
The plan solutions and inner communications are shown in only a very elementary way.

ENTRY 187
"576768"

GENERAL
The metaphor of interlocking floor volumes to represent the interchange of knowledge seems somewhat forced and banal, and has not led to a very convincing end-result.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The massing blocks some important vistas from the north, and a series of wide underpasses does not make a particularly attractive environment for pedestrians. Architecturally, the massing and treatment of the elevations seem crude and forced.

USABILITY
The internal planning is not especially interesting or inspiring.

UNIQUENESS
The attempt to make a unique addition to the campus feels forced and artificial.
ENTRY 188  
"PYTHAGORAS"

GENERAL
A group of six curved buildings occupy the western part of the competition area almost completely, with some glass-roofed, street-like space left between the buildings.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The principle used for locating the buildings in this proposal means that it is impossible to have a positive square or landscape area. The buildings protrude too closely to the former main building. The view toward it from the north-west has been cut off totally. The proposed buildings and their design style are completely alien to this environment.

USABILITY
Various space groups have been presented in the floor plans, which otherwise remain schematic and just show corridors and rooms.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal has remained undeveloped both architecturally and in terms of the cityscape.

ENTRY 189  
"THE BLEND"

GENERAL
A canyon is created between two large masses in this design and represents a spatially impressive pedestrian area.

URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
The architecture deviates from Otaniemi’s built environment in quite a fundamental way. In places, the design of the buildings seems pretentious. A central exterior space that would bring people and activities together is missing.

USABILITY
The connection to a separate metro station is not the best possible solution. The pedestrian area spread over many levels is not seen as particularly successful.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal represents the mainstream of contemporary architecture, and its relationship to Alvar Aalto’s red-brick architecture is distant.
Phase 1 *Individual Evaluation*

$x$  WITHOUT EVALUATION

The following entries did not propose any extension building in Otaniemi.

**ENTRY 016**
"UNBUILT OTANIEMI"

**ENTRY 114**
"VENCEDOR"
Entries approved for Continuation

The candidates selected for continuation were the following:

ENTRY 011
"stay strong sweetie"

ENTRY 075
"HIPSTERKASBAH"

ENTRY 125
"492700"

ENTRY 131
"VÄRE"

ENTRY 135
"AINOA"

ENTRY 176
"NOLLI"
Instructions for Phase 2

6.1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The basis for developing the entries was the same criteria used for Phase 1. In addition, the jury wished to highlight the following recommendations for Phase 2 competitors:

- The chosen competitors should develop their entries so that possible ideas for future building possibilities and landscaping of the entire competition area should be shown clearly in the overall town plan for the area. Buildings on the edges of the competition area, beyond those designed for the School of Arts, Design and Architecture, will eventually be used for the activities of other Aalto University schools or the university’s joint functions. It is clear that the development of the Otaniemi campus needs new building opportunities, particularly in the vicinity of the metro line. Competitors should consider how the entire competition area could be developed, including buildings, landscape, and traffic solutions.

- A major part of the Arts Building complex should be located in an area southwest of a line running roughly from the Data Building in the west to the old main auditorium.

- The different parts of the Arts Building should have good internal communications.

- There should be close and well-functioning contacts between the metro station, the entrances to the new Aalto ARTS Building, and the former main building and library, while respecting the open landscape principles of Aalto’s original design. The metro station should be integrated into the new building complex and the entrance facilities above ground should not be implemented according to the present design. The planning of the above-ground entrance should be considered part of the competition assignment.

- There should be a clear main entrance and major foyer space for the new Aalto ARTS Building complex.

- Administrative services should be provided in close proximity to users. Office space should be primarily distributed among research and learning facilities. The shape and arrangement of the office space should encourage clear and effective communication between different users.

- Care should be taken in ensuring that all working space has adequate daylight.
Daylight should be available in large work areas, workshops, or other collective areas. These areas should preferably not be located underground. Wherever possible, it would be an advantage if workshop and studio activities can be observed by passers-by. Workshops should not be designed specifically for the needs of particular functions, but should be flexible enough to allow different types of use over time.

The university does not intend building any more raked lecture theatres, and all teaching facilities should be designed in a manner allowing flexible use for many different purposes.

It is strongly recommended to create views over the campus and possibly even towards the surrounding seascape, using parts of the upper stories or roofs for that purpose.

The competitors were also required to show how a building expansion of 8,000 m² could best be located within the VTT area. It should be naturally integrated with the new campus centre. This is necessary to enable simultaneous progress to be made on the detailed revised town plan for the entire area. Attention should be paid to the design of the area between VTT's block and the campus centre's new structures to avoid the creation of anything that looks like a backyard.

It was considered extremely important that competitors should develop their designs in a balanced and sustainable manner, taking due account of Finland's climatic challenges and ensuring that the building performs in an economic and environmentally friendly fashion.

As the quality of the entire environment is of crucial importance, the competitors should indicate how the area will appear during the winter and long periods of darkness. An indication of the general external lighting principles would also be useful.

It was considered extremely important that competitors should develop their designs in a balanced and sustainable manner, taking due account of Finland's climatic challenges and ensuring that the building performs in an economic and environmentally friendly fashion.

As the quality of the entire environment is of crucial importance, the competitors should indicate how the area will appear during the winter and long periods of darkness. An indication of the general external lighting principles would also be useful.
6.2 SUMMARY OF SPACES
Aalto ARTS Building complex
(20,500 m² net area)
> 35,000 grm² (gross floor area)

Departments to be located in the building complex:
× Art
× Architecture and Landscape
× Design
× Media

Food Court Restaurant 5,500 grm²
Commercial premises and metro
Entrance hall 6,500 grm²
Total area to be implemented 47,000 grm²

6.3 CONFIDENTIALITY
The competition was pseudonymous. All documents had to be marked with the pseudonym chosen for Phase 1.

6.4 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR PHASE 2

Unique solution
× The solution should promote the image of a future-oriented university campus that fosters sustainability in its goals and values and inspires innovative development
× The solution should be unique, memorable, and generate enthusiastic interest worldwide.

Usability as a learning environment and a centre for research and art
× The spaces of the new building should offer a variety of different inspiring atmospheres, conducive to creative, contemplative, and debate-based activity, and encourage interaction between the members of the academic community, as well as individual endeavours.

Quality of urban landscape and architecture
× The proposal should constitute a high-quality and inspiring overall solution for the urban landscape and architecture, offering a balanced yet provocative relationship between the central square and the buildings and open/green areas surrounding it;
× They should form a new and appealing intellectual centre for the campus, linked to the metro station and other facilities;
× They should stimulate a dialogue with the important buildings in the neighbourhood and the immediate environment.

Ecological sustainability
The sustainability evaluation consisted of three steps:
× The design teams should describe and argue how their proposals minimize the impact on the environment
× The design teams undertook to create an energy-efficient comprehensive solution
× The design teams undertook to reach an S2 target value for indoor environment level defined under the Finnish classification of indoor environments.

Feasibility
× Overall cost-effectiveness was the primary target
× The solution had to be based on healthy, high-quality technical solutions
× The solution should be feasible in terms of its life-span durability and flexibility
× The overall solution and its potential for further development had priority over individual details.
All six proposals were received by the deadline on 15 May 2013.

The proposals were put on show to the general public from 14 to 28 June 2013. All the proposals were also posted on the competition website, and the public had the opportunity to give their comments on the entries. The summary of community comments was available for the work group and the Jury on 2 August.

The entire Jury held three meetings to evaluate the proposals and the preparatory work group convened four times.

The Jury requested expert analyses on traffic, ecological sustainability, and scope / costs. The Jury made its decision on the winners at its meeting on 16 August 2013.
General Evaluation of Phase 2

All six finalists had responded to the invitation to improve their first-stage proposals and submitted their revised ideas. In the majority of cases, the schemes had improved considerably; much attention was given to further improving the fit of the new buildings within the given area whilst developing the external spaces as more attractive and appropriate locations for collective as well as individual activities.

Adjusting floor plans to accord with the organizers’ updated room programme and refining each project’s inherent ideas in the light of the Jury’s intermediate remarks and recommendations have also been tackled in a commendable manner. Further thought had been given to developing the facilities for both traditional and new pedagogical processes, as well as adjusting the spaces to improve their long-term potential for flexibility in their intended use as well as for alternative use.

Unfortunately, a few of the plans seemed to regress in some ways rather than improve, either as a result of an over-literal response to the Jury’s comments or by failing to develop their original promising sketches into a convincing and feasible end-result. The result of the best works submitted for Phase 2 demonstrated that the ambitions and expectations of the university, the organizers, and the Jury members can be met in an exemplary and inspiring manner, whilst still remaining broadly within the projected financial budget.

Naturally, a building is never complete without its users, in this case, people involved in the creative and applied arts. The chosen solution fulfils the high demands for a new kind of stimulating collection of spaces for creative learning, both at an interdisciplinary level as well as within the bounds of traditional professional expertise. Although the functional and visual qualities of the best solution are clearly shown and convincingly demonstrated in the documents, it is worth remembering that the best built environments should engage with all the senses. This will require sensitive, painstaking, and meticulous care and attention on the part of the university’s directors, their project managers, and the entire design team during the remaining development and construction process.

Once built, the winning entry is expected to set a new standard for future university learning environments, not only in Finland but also internationally. The long and difficult two-stage open international competition process has more than justified its purpose, having not only provided the organizers with an excellent starting-point for the continuation of the new ARTS Building project, but in revealing a galaxy of new and innovative ideas that could and should be developed further, either within the realms of Aalto University and the Otaniemi district or within other university areas around the world. The new ARTS Building is a clear signal and positive symbol for the start of a new and exciting era in higher education.
All the entries include the required floor space. The gross floor area is smallest in “492700 Leap” and “Väre”. “492700 Leap” and “Väre” are the most economic. From an ecological point of view, the best entries are “492700 Leap”, “Nolli”, and “Ainoa”. “Väre” also has some potentially interesting elements, but is very difficult to evaluate before more exact design is done (for ex. modularity concept design).

### GROSS FLOOR AREA AND UNIT PRICE €/M² (GROSS FLOOR AREA) OF THE ENTRIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Parking Area</th>
<th>Unit Price 1</th>
<th>Unit Price 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“stay strong sweetie”</td>
<td>52 900 m²</td>
<td>18 800 m²</td>
<td>2 800 €/m²</td>
<td>1 800 €/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“HIPSTERKASBAH”</td>
<td>52 900 m²</td>
<td>20 300 m²</td>
<td>2 900 €/m²</td>
<td>3 400 €/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“492700 Leap”</td>
<td>44 900 m²</td>
<td>12 200 m²</td>
<td>3 100 €/m²</td>
<td>2 000 €/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Väre”</td>
<td>46 300 m²</td>
<td>13 500 m²</td>
<td>3 000 €/m²</td>
<td>2 300 €/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ainoa”</td>
<td>52 600 m²</td>
<td>14 200 m²</td>
<td>3 100 €/m²</td>
<td>2 200 €/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Nolli”</td>
<td>45 600 m²</td>
<td>12 800 m²</td>
<td>3 500 €/m²</td>
<td>2 000 €/m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual Evaluation of Phase 2 Entries

(IN OPENING ORDER)
ENTRY 011

"stay strong sweetie"
GENERAL
A lyrical and serene project that has improved considerably following the first phase. The original central themes have been faithfully adhered to and refined to produce a new and vital reinterpretation of the existing, almost timeless redbrick campus architecture. The result creates a tranquil and peaceful atmosphere, devoid of the restlessness of so much trendy and sensation-seeking architecture currently on offer on the international stage. However, despite these valued attributes, the scheme makes little attempt to address the university’s requirements for spatial solutions that encourage and promote departmental interactivity and multidisciplinary learning and research.

The entry offers a clear hierarchy of spatial sequences and events, which follow the routing patterns of the original campus plan. Classic courtyards and single-sided corridors mediate
the varying heights of the building masses of the new overlapping departments. The learning centre and new metro station entrance have been strengthened by a new central focus point, the Forest Hall, which forms an appropriate and handsome partner to the main auditorium in the overall landscape. Unfortunately, the extra space required by this addition is not included in the original programme and would need a rethink.

The entry’s appeal is rooted in the subtlety and intelligence of its starting-points: a clear commitment to and respect for the existing built environment by reinterpreting and exploiting the materials and principles used for the original campus design. The approach is clearly evolutionary rather than revolutionary, building pragmatically on ideas and motifs present in the existing area.

**URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE**

The entry builds on the concept and traditions of the original layout to create a new triangular open green meadow framed by the undulating edge of the new ARTS Buildings, the north façade of the former main building, and the low silhouette of the existing wood technology buildings. Due to the existing ground levels, the new meadow space is dished and its centre-point is almost a storey lower than the edges. This has the effect of lending a more intimate feel to the space, making it suitable for organizing both large and small outdoor events. This fine landscape gesture offers a variety of routes both direct and meandering, alongside and through it.

The ARTS Building complex is composed of a variety of courtyards and interconnected buildings arranged along a singular route. The existing avenue of lindens has now been retained in its entirety, forming an important part of the new main entry arrangements. The proposed Forest Hall sits at the western edge and junction of this landscape network, forming a natural gathering and assembly place for the new School and the entrance Plaza. The large scale of the meadow is tightened at this meeting-point before opening up again into two long landscape vistas to the northwest and southwest.

A similar device, albeit on a smaller scale, is deployed within the new building complex to form a spatial backbone for the new School. Long
internal paths (corridors) are punctuated by T- or cross-junctions. The experience of moving along these routes is accentuated and enlivened by a rhythmic interlacing of vistas opening out into either cloistered courtyards, open forecourts, framed views of significant landmarks, or glimpses of workshop activities. What at first appears to be a simple, traditional, and almost mundane spatial organization is in fact deceptively rich and enjoyable, in the same way that a theme and its variations are. The external and internal routing network is the strength of this design, forming an equal partnership and multi-level dialogue between the landscape and the built environment.

The architectural character of the design is of a distinctly high and persuasive calibre; one rarely encounters this kind of confident, elegant, and serene monumentality in current university institutions. It is sympathetic, restrained, and relaxed but not averse to offering an impressive powerful gesture of architectural force and agility, as in the Forest Hall or the descending main plaza. The Hall, however, is overtly sacral in character and the suspended brick mass over the plaza seems too heavy in this context and would necessitate a rethink.

The scheme’s inherent architectural character leans in places too much towards the sacred and the traditional, qualities that can be found in many major universities through the ages. This raises the question about the viability or suitability of the scheme as the first chapter in a new period of Otaniemi’s development.

Aalto’s original university is still one of the most influential and unique university environments in Europe, despite some of its technical and functional shortcomings. This entry accepts and understands this fully and has demonstrated that the architectural modus operandi of the existing site still has the power to evoke and inspire new architectural interpretations along similar principles. The result would certainly attract a visitor interested in architecture, but hardly represents the sort of groundbreaking solution that encourages and supports interdisciplinary interaction or promotes new learning innovations, aims that are high on the agenda for Aalto University.
USABILITY
Following the first stage, the designers have paid much attention to consolidating the simple planning principles of their original concept, arranging departments along the main spinal route as though they were elements plugged into a main thoroughfare. This has the advantage of providing future opportunities for expanding individual elements, but has led to an exaggerated elongation of the entire building. This spread-out approach fails to provide sufficient support for interaction between different disciplines or create sufficient and suitable places for informal meetings, a key requirement of the original programme. Admittedly, this is partially compensated for by the provision of more spaces with direct or near direct access to the landscape, as well as producing an end-result that could be easily realized in several phases. The connection between the metro station and the main entrance and towards the former main building is unnecessarily complicated.

The designers have tried to avoid the disadvantages of a traditional central corridor system but, as mentioned above, this has been at the expense of a degree of inefficiency in the disposition of the plan. The extreme lengths of some of the routes would also be tedious for users, despite attempts to articulate and enliven the experience. The distances between some departments are quite long and would not encourage interaction. The use of both narrow and medium-depth frames provides users with an acceptable level of spatial possibilities and generic adaptability during the
lifespan of the building. The location of the central learning centre is not ideal for ARTS users, but is good for the university community as a whole, as it is close to the metro station entrances. The Forest Hall is a new addition to the programme. Handsome though it undoubtedly is, its function and feasibility are questionable.

UNIQUENESS
The proposal offers some stimulating new spatial experiences and user potential. Its originality is partially based on the designers’ desire to distance themselves from some aspects of contemporary architectural issues and trends. They have clearly wanted to develop a more abstract and powerful version of the old campus, an architecture that speaks more of an assured and confident general atmosphere, rather than a pluralistic and overactive approach to place-making that is so prevalent in many new university complexes recently completed or under construction.

The design builds on the values and principles inherent in the existing campus, while at the same time creating a series of distinct places that are clearly timeless, but still of our time. While its lack of compact design, its obsession with long and relatively uneventful corridor routes, and its reluctance to provide physical opportunities for inter-disciplinary interaction are clear weaknesses, this scheme is nevertheless one of the most beautiful of the proposals.
ENTRY 075

"HIPSTERKASBAH"

GENERAL

“HIPSTERKASBAH” consists of a number of separate buildings and pavilions that form an interesting urban composition. Instead of creating a singular landmark to compete with Alvar Aalto’s Otaniemi, the designers of “HIPSTERKASBAH” propose a conglomerate of buildings to form a new, village-like neighbourhood. Their aim is to create an urban experience with its own strong identity and vivid street life. The tight street network allows learning spaces, shops, bars, and cafés to open up into public spaces.

Although the proposal consists of a number of separate buildings, it seems to have started off as one large volume, which has been cut into pieces, making room for streets, alleys, and squares. The alleys are narrow and give an attractive and intimate, almost medieval feel. The proposal has a very strong urban feel, which is new for Otaniemi.

“HIPSTERKASBAH” moves away from an all-embracing homogenous campus architectural style towards a more pluralistic and diverse concoction – and shows us something that is currently lacking in Otaniemi: a dense urban environment that encourages spontaneous creativity.
URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE

The new buildings are robust and workshop-like in character. The spaces are not precious, but rather adaptable and inspiring. The solid volumes are clad with contemporary interpretations of Otaniemi’s classic textures and materials. “HIPSTERKASBAH” fits into the existing urban structure quite well and creates interesting exterior spaces around and inside it.

The main plaza is well-proportioned and is successfully located in front of the former main building. The new main axes lead naturally towards the former main building and its entrances. Aalto’s library is also naturally located in the middle of a large park. The general planning solution follows the Aalto master plan: soft vs. hard – a green environment to the east of the former main building against a more structured and rough approach to the west. The additional building in front of the existing Library is not entirely convincing, however, as it feels too weak and remote.

During the first phase, the architecture in “HIPSTERKASBAH” looked a little clumsy and dubious. Further work has improved this tremendously. This very exciting and promising scheme has been further developed in many respects on the basis of the Jury’s recommendations.
USABILITY
The street layout has been completely revised. Much effort has been given to reducing the number of alleyways, varying in width and overall length, bisecting the area and reassessing their routes and relative widths.

The new buildings and the former main building are connected through the plaza. The alleys are narrow and, given the Finnish climate, might be problematic in use. The sheer number of alleyways may even hinder the effective day-to-day workability of the ARTS Building. Some could be covered, but would they lose their appeal and become dead gallery hallways instead? The metro is in a separate building, in line with the existing metro plans, but would be easy to incorporate within the proposal.

Faculties are located in individual buildings, which function both as separate units and as a combined campus. Each building contains a separate faculty or other unit. Is there the danger that with so many individual buildings they would become enclaves for different disciplines, rather than encouraging cross-disciplinary cooperation?

The basic configuration of the buildings is vertically divided into three areas. The ground floor contains large, hall-like functions, with extensive goods and people traffic. Most of the workshops are located on the ground floors. Other ground floor functions include amenities, such as restaurants, shops, galleries, and showrooms.

The upper levels of the buildings contain teaching space, studios, and administration and support spaces. Classroom spaces have windows to the street and alleys, as well as skylights and views within the building volume as appropriate. These elements should guarantee plentiful daylight in the upper levels.

Rooftops are also used, which is positive. Some of the roof configurations, however, seem somewhat constrained and unjustified.

The floor plans have been improved tremendously since the first phase. There is still a lack of consideration for long-term flexibility, however, as the plans are over-specific in many places and would benefit from being more generic in terms of spatial organization. There are still too many building volumes and include some sharp corners that could prove difficult to use effectively.

The large footprint of the design undermines its economic efficiency. Numerous expensive elevators are needed to gain vertical accessibility in many buildings. The large footprint also reduces the opportunities for expansion in the surrounding area.

UNIQUENESS
Some of the irregular shapes of the volumes are visually interesting. The architectural outlook of the village-campus concept has been reconsidered in line with the Jury’s comments during the first phase. Material choices and differences in dimension follow their location and orientation. The robust and understated architecture of the first phase has been retained successfully. The rough nature of many of the workspaces is very appropriate, as this learning environment is very much based on the notion of learning by doing.

“HIPSTERKASBAH” is unique among the entries in its urban village concept. The originality of the concept is the design’s strength. Phase 2 revealed the difficulties and weaknesses inherent in the concept, however, despite the tremendous improvements made to the overall design.
ENTRY 125

"492700 Leap"
GENERAL
An extremely thoroughly studied and worked-out project. All the central aspects and requirements of the programme have received a well-founded answer in this project. This is also evident in the elegant presentation of the project and its detailed and well-argued description. The Jury’s recommendations for Phase 2 have been taken into consideration in a convincing way. The entry is a very strong one, especially for its urban touch, the qualities of its interior spaces, and its overall feasibility.
The starting-point of this entry is a freestanding independent building, covered by a unifying single roof. This building grows together with a more elaborated complex containing shopping premises and a food court closely connected to the metro station. At the same time, the design also has clear urban and landscape qualities. A new main square is created between the metro station, the new ARTS Building, and the former main building and library, uniting them. In contrast to and as compensation for the new building volume, a rather wide, free-flowing green area has been created north of the new building, continuing and giving new additional importance to the old campus idea.

The seemingly compact new building is, in fact, divided up with several inner courtyards and gardens. Outdoor spaces around the building extend into it in interesting ways: covered walkways and galleries at ground and basement level, as well as terraces and balconies in the upper floors. The designs of outdoor and indoor spaces have been richly integrated in an original manner. A walkway acting as a clear main axis traverses the building from northwest to southeast and also connects the site’s existing buildings to the metro station.

The new white concrete building stands in clear contrast to the old Aalto buildings and symbolizes the arrival of an important new activity to the old campus area. Both in terms of scale and in the amount of free space around it, the building can create a dialogue with the old buildings. The straightforward character of the building, reminiscent of industrial structures, continues some aspects of Aalto’s campus idea, where more factory-like laboratories accompany the delicately composed main building. We should not forget either that Aalto liked to use white walls in some important locations to lighten the otherwise brick-dominated environment. The new building volume covered mainly by a single roof is rather large in scale, compared to its older neighbours, however. On the other hand, its individual façades are roughly on a similar scale to the older buildings.

The main views towards the old buildings have been given due consideration. The avenue of lindens to the southwest ends in a new square in front of the old Library, which forms part of the new main square facing the new ARTS Building on its eastern side. The view from the west towards the old main auditorium is left open as part of the rather wide campus greenery created north of the ARTS Building. Could the north-eastern corner of the new building be reduced somewhat so that something of the view to the surrounding landscape from the administrative wing of the former main building could be preserved?
Possible future extensions are shown north of the new campus greenery, north of today’s Otaniementie and south of the existing library, using volumes that give well-defined limits to these outdoor spaces.

The idea of sheltered walkways around and through the building is excellent, as is the idea of providing an open visual link to the main working areas, which are also visible to anyone outside. The architectural concept of the building means that the cantilevered upper floors extend above the shaded terrain floor. It is open to debate, however, whether this represents an unnecessarily strong contrast to the older campus buildings, which are firmly rooted at ground level. Outdoor spaces under overhangs are not always very pleasant either. The possibility of creating protected arcades around the building with pillars at ground level could perhaps be considered.

The façades are unpretentious, but clear-cut thanks to their simple structure. Their factory- or laboratory-like character could even be strengthened. At the moment, some elevations and the balconies they incorporate could be seen as reminiscent of hotel resort buildings.

In contrast to the rather clear-cut exteriors, the interiors are rich and varied with their network of galleries, offering a large range of differing views towards inner courtyards and gardens and the campus landscape outside. The provision of articulated daylight in the important working and studio areas has received much attention. The urban-like network of varying indoor and outdoor spaces creates numerous opportunities for spontaneous meetings and contacts between users.

**USABILITY**

The footprint of the new building is extremely compact, resulting in short distances and protected connections to the different parts of the building. The disposition of the space, as well as inner communications and the link to the metro, have been extremely well looked at. The walkway from the metro station towards the main entrance needs to be more inviting, however. The extensive use of a lowered basement level, including sunken courtyards and gardens, may cause some difficulties for people to orientate themselves inside the building, but is a good way to reduce the total building volume visible above ground.
level. On the other hand, it creates a richness of spatial variation in the vertical dimension. Using the rooftop partly for relaxation spaces, offering views over the campus landscape, adds to these qualities. In places, it would be difficult for some users to enjoy direct natural light or to see or sense the landscaped surroundings owing to the depth of the building. This is a definite disadvantage, especially in a building used by people involved with the visual arts. The lighting benefits offered by the large atrium courtyards and light wells in spring, summer, and autumn would be dramatically reduced in winter owing to the low angle of the sun. The possibility of covering some of the courtyards with glass roofs, even movable ones, could be considered.

Underground parking has now been arranged under the square and the green areas on the side of the building, which allows greater flexibility in the construction and spatial arrangements of the building. The entrance ramps to the basement level parking area need further study, however. The entrance from the southeast is cleverly integrated in a potential future building, but is difficult to enter arriving from the east. Placing another ramp just in front of the main entrance of the former main building must be considered an error, which can be corrected in further development of the project within the limits of the basic solution.

The new ARTS Building in this design would perhaps not be easy to realize on a phased basis, if needed. The construction system and grid-like distribution of spaces give great future inner flexibility to the scheme on the other hand.

The designer has put in a lot of work to ensure its overall feasibility (These qualities will be commented on in additional expert statements).

UNIQUENESS

The compact and at the same time very vivid solution of this design has some unique qualities. The architectural character of the entry is timeless and quite restrained in some way, rather than being trendy or sensational in any respect. The straightforward character of the structures, interior spaces, and façades has an industrial flavour that could provide a solid and at the same time inspiring background for studies and creative work. The multitude of potential meeting and contact places and areas offered represent a particularly strong quality of this entry.
ENTRY 131
"VÄRE"
A strong and convincing entry, which has been developed positively and has managed to answer most of the questions posed by the Jury after the first stage. The layout offers its own structural DNA matrix as the organizing principle for the new ARTS Buildings, forming this pattern from two of the principal coordinates taken from the former main building and library.

By varying the heights and elevational treatment of the resulting modules, the geometry has been intelligently exploited to create a compact deep-plan building that nevertheless feels like a collection of smaller buildings, helping to adjust the scale of the new structure to its surroundings. The approach is fresh and the simple basic module produces a convincing variety of spatial arrangements that are adaptable and flexible while still having a clear and distinct architectural character.

The spatial concept has also found an appropriate form, in which users move from the general public areas upwards towards more private and intimate places or from interdisciplinary to more specialized activities, a mode of operation completely in tune with Aalto University’s aims.
URBAN LANDSCAPE & ARCHITECTURE

The unique grid allows the new building to react and adjust easily to its neighbours. Despite grouping all facilities under one roof, the rhombic geometry allows for varying the heights of each module element from 2 to 4 storeys, creating the welcome illusion that the entire ARTS Building is composed of a compact cluster of smaller buildings. The new framed views of the Main Auditorium and the articulation of the proposed main entrance plaza are especially convincing, forming one of the most attractive and engaging of the new urban spaces proposed in the entries. Varying the dimensioning and sizing of the individual modules should be investigated further, however, as they are too reminiscent of storage containers in their present form. The series of smaller-scale gables compliments the former main building and auditorium in an interesting way. As well as providing an interesting and well-modulated series of routes in and around the building, the design opens up the potential for limited access to the rooftops, offering terraces and views in many directions including to the sea.

On the whole, the external massing and architectural language used is beautifully scaled and articulated using a limited palette of simple materials that offer adaptations of Otaniemi’s familiar redbrick collection. The use of the two coordinates here comes into its own, as the separate masses twist and turn in a relaxed but rigorous manner. However, the architectural handling of the complex lacks some finesse and originality, despite the confident and sympathetic nature of the approach. Despite their apparent attractiveness and appeal, the articulation of the building mass and proposed façade treatments recall some other well-known contemporary public buildings. Further thought should be given to the role, function, and nature of the various facades. They could be developed in a more original manner by varying the module size and studying other types of elevations.

The confident and sympathetic character of the external architecture does not follow through into the internal spaces, which are of a very different calibre from the outside envelope, especially in the central cluster areas. The usage of elements similar to the external elevations within the building’s interior would help reinforce the idea of a larger building composed of separate pavilions. Workshop and studio spaces have been given an appropriate, rougher industrial feel, however. Within the context of such a large complex, there are a number of possibilities for further developing a range of different, but appropriate atmospheres.
USABILITY

The designers have improved the overall functional planning of their entry, highlighting and making clearer principal routes through the building, as well as rationalizing the number and location of points of vertical circulation. The inbuilt flexibility of the basic structural geometry allows for different spaces to be organized either horizontally or vertically. As mentioned earlier, this flexibility could be improved still further by studying the dimensioning of the modules and considering the possibility of varying the depth and surface area in some cases.

In the model presented, there is a clear logic to having workshop areas on the ground floor with studios directly above, followed by classrooms with staff work spaces on the upper floors. While this is one clear and natural alternative, it could be easily adjusted to achieve some degree of overlapping between departments and/or service areas.

The four-storey maximum height of the building allows for relatively easy visual connections and interaction possibilities between the different floors and disciplines. The character of each of the three or four cluster atriums is too similar in their present form, and thought should be given to varying their character, shape, or dimensions. More attention has been given to maximizing natural light penetration into the deep interior spaces, as well as creating interesting vistas from the interior, and this seems to have been thoroughly carried out in the main.

The division between more public and lively areas on the lower floors and more small-scale, quieter space on the upper floors suitable for concentrated work is an excellent concept. Service facilities have been developed successfully and the interplay between the metro station, food court, shops, and main entrance areas would be an active and stimulating urban addition to Otaniemi.
Floor Plan Level + 15.80, Offices
The overall message of this proposal is that it is possible to deviate from the building design principles inherent in the old campus to create a place with its own clear character but still fitting in comfortably and positively with its older neighbours. In addition, it has the potential to become an engaging architectural tour de force that could become a world-class centre of creativity for its users.

Although just a single building, “Väre” offers an impressive urban complex with some outstanding qualities. The components used in the design are quite basic and universal in their forms and architecture – it is the urban insights that the design contains that make the proposal absolutely unique in its context and a contrast to the other entries.

**UNIQUENESS**

The scheme has realized the promise contained in the original first-stage sketches and offers a stimulating, but sympathetic solution to the challenges set by the competition.

As a starting-point for the continuing development of the new ARTS Building, the central ideas have much to commend them. The project radiates enthusiasm and confidence, and the architectural strategy would open a new chapter in the development of the Otaniemi story. It clearly demonstrates that a wide range of spaces can be formed from a small but ingenious basic module. This is particularly highlighted in the intriguing axonometric floor plan of the main entrance and plaza area.
ENTRY 135

"AINOA"
GENERAL
This very exciting and promising scheme has been further developed in many respects, taking into account the Jury’s recommendations. The main ideas are very strong at a conceptual level. Many improvements have been made. Many questions related to the practical functions and feasibility of the project still remain only vaguely or insufficiently resolved, however.
URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE
This design combines a strong urban quality with an elegant landscape treatment. Using one big gesture, a wide bow of new building elevations, the designer has created a new central square in front of the former main building and library, uniting the old and new buildings and giving good connections to and from the new metro station. The new glazed façades compliment the old Aalto buildings, creating both a dialogue and a contrast with them. A cupola-shaped learning centre extends from the new façade line, creating an interesting focus.

The main views towards the old buildings have been taken into consideration well and incorporated effectively. The avenue of lindens to the southwest ends in the new square. The view from the west towards the old main auditorium is left open in an interesting way: a dense group of new building volumes frames an alley-like second square that frames Aalto’s auditorium in sequence.

The designer proposes new buildings opposite the existing library and the northwest wing of the former main building, to create well-defined urban spaces in the near vicinity of the new ARTS Building.

The rear façades of the new building have a more varied form. Much work has been devoted to refining these elevations, even extending to some somewhat superficial colour systems that have little connection with this context. Generally, the architectural touch of the design is very solid and logical, however.

The designer has also given a lot of thought to creating a roof landscape to act as a kind of third façade, combining greenery and paved areas. The intention has been to let the buildings rise from the earth and continue the campus landscape in a new form. A vast angled solar panel is shown at the southern edge of the new building. While this may work as a symbol for modern ecological technology, it does not fit very naturally with its surroundings.

The idea of vast open galleries, in which free-form smaller rooms or halls give a contrast and dominate the interiors, has not been developed further and is not very clearly illustrated either. The workshops have rougher character, reminiscent of factory halls. These are all interesting themes, but illustrated only in very sketchy form. The new light wells do not have the same appealing character as the design’s other areas.

USABILITY
The disposition of the different functions of the building is mainly very clear: commercial and common spaces close to the metro station, more public learning spaces opening towards the new unifying square, along which the learning centre forms a new focal point and marks the main entrance to the study spaces, and finally workshops and studios facing the opposite sides of the building complex, with good accessibility for service traffic. The spaces are shown in a very general way, emphasizing the flexibility of the concept.

Many crucial questions have been left open, however. The author proposes a generalist structural system based on a 10 x 15 metre grid. It has been left open as to how this system would work with the spaces and how, for example, the pillars relate to different spaces, especially in the generally oval classroom and group work spaces.
How practical these rooms, especially the smaller ones, would be is also questionable. Some of the vertical communications have been located in such a way as to make them difficult to find.

The question of whether there would be sufficient daylight in working areas has also remained only partially resolved. Although a series of light wells penetrating the building have been provided, many spaces, especially the smaller ones, remain distant from sources of daylight. Even potential window areas on the sides of the building are partly shut off because of the sloping green roofs covering some of the rear façades.

The elaborated roof surfaces, with their terraces and green areas, play an important part in the architectural concept of this design. It could be questioned, however, whether the roof areas intended for walking or staying outdoors are oversized, taking maintenance issues into consideration, for example. Some attention has been given to sustainability and ecological issues in the long and intriguing discussions included with the design, but the views presented are of a rather general nature without being clearly communicated in the design itself.

**UNIQUENESS**

The entry is clearly one of the most innovative, individual, and unique projects in the entire competition. The main idea – to create a unifying, intensive urban square between the old Aalto buildings and the new buildings using one big bow of curving façades – is an extremely strong concept and creates an exciting dialogue between old and new. Although the design has been extensively refined during Phase 2, it remains at the conceptual level in many areas, unfortunately. The designer has failed to clearly demonstrate how the building, its structure, inner communications, and daylight solutions really work. The proposal remains essentially a promising, albeit brilliant vision.
ENTRY 176
"NOLLI"
GENERAL
There are many singular buildings in Otaniemi: the former main building complex, Alvar Aalto’s library and Dipoli, designed by Reima and Raili Pietilä, to mention just three of many. “NOLLI’s” urban approach has been to complete the urban structure by inserting three separate new buildings carefully into the urban fabric. These were almost identical in Phase 1 of the competition. In Phase 2, they have been essentially replaced with a single building, whose size and character stand out strongly in the Otaniemi landscape.

The new ARTS Building has a comb-like layout, which is repeated through the entire structure. The proposal is a thoroughly worked-out design at the technical and functional level and has been presented professionally.
URBAN LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE

The massive ARTS Building and two additional buildings, which are completely characterless, are confidently and comfortably placed around the main plaza close to the existing buildings. The two additional volumes sit in their surroundings well, but the ARTS Building has become too large. On the urban level, the relation of the new buildings and outdoor spaces to the existing Aalto buildings was handled more successfully in the first-phase proposal.

Links from the west are good, but the monumental axis leading from the T-house to the former main building is too rigid. The shapes of the masses complement their positioning. Pleasant, pocket-like outdoor spaces have been created on all sides of the buildings.

The structure of the ARTS Building is unnecessarily repetitive. The facades, with their high glass walls and vertical wooden elements, are too schematic and lack individuality. The architecture seems to have developed in the wrong direction as a result of the changes made to the first-stage design. The ARTS Building has become too formalistic and overpowering, with repetitive facades and a seemingly never-ending series of roof lanterns.

USABILITY

Shops, offices, and restaurants are located at ground level, where they can open out either externally onto the new public space or internally onto an internal street. This street traverses the ARTS Building from north to south. The meandering interior street in the first phase was more interesting than this one, however. The floor plans have become too generic and lack character, comfort, and the element of surprise. The ARTS Building has become too repetitive and dull.

The metro is placed in a separate building, in line with the existing metro plans, but it would be easy to incorporate its entrance areas within the new ARTS proposal.

UNIQUENESS

The building is built from robust materials. The facades are glazed with opaque insulated panels covered by screens of full-height timber columns. The result is quite generic, however, and would need further study to become totally convincing.

“NOLLI” was among the most promising proposals in Phase 1; unfortunately, it has lost many of its best qualities during Phase 2.
Result of the Competition

The jury has selected the entry “Väre” as the first prize-winner. It is the scheme that most successfully has resolved the challenges and conflicting demands of the competition task.

The decision was made after voting and the result was not unanimous. Jury members Celsing and Helander were in favour of the entry “492700 Leap” and jury member Hahl in favour of the entry “Ainoa” as the winner.

Vilhelm Helander and Tuomo Hahl informed that they will content themselves with the majority decision. Johan Celsing still reserved himself in favour of the entry “492700 Leap”.

The second prize is awarded to the entry “492700 Leap”.

The third prize is awarded to the entry “stay strong sweetie”.

First purchase prize is awarded to the entry “Ainoa”, second purchase prize to the entry “HIPSTERKASBAH” and third purchase prize to the entry “NOLLI”.

FIRST PRIZE
“Väre”
SECOND PRIZE
“492700 Leap”
THIRD PRIZE
“stay strong sweetie”

FIRST PURCHASE
“Ainoa”
SECOND PURCHASE
“HIPSTERKASBAH”
THIRD PURCHASE
“NOLLI”
Furthermore, the jury decided to grant six honourable mentions, to the following entries:

**ENTRY 24**  
“The Butterfly Effect”  
“The Butterfly Effect” is a bold and strong and elegantly presented proposal that makes an interesting contrast with the existing red-brick Otaniemi.

**ENTRY 131**  
“Ah”  
The proposal presents a clearly defined urban landscape in harmony with the existing environment.

**ENTRY 37**  
“ARTery”  
“ARTery” presents a fascinating and philosophically inspiring stimulating solution, with a leaf-like cluster of independent but interconnected departments.

**ENTRY 121**  
“0073”  
The new hillock forms a memorable and unique centrepiece for a beautiful landscape composition connecting the university campus to the seashore.

**ENTRY 95**  
“TAHBAJP”  
“TAHBAJP” offers a refreshing reinterpretation of the traditional collegial courtyard model.

**ENTRY 153**  
“STUDIO CLOUD”  
“STUDIO CLOUD” is a very promising and interesting concept: a small-scale environment that offers an aesthetically pleasing modern interpretation of the university with separate studios and intimate courtyards.
**Jury’s recommendation for further development**

The Jury strongly recommends that the commission for the architectural design of developing and realizing the project will be given to the authors of the winning entry.

The Jury further recommends that the winning entry will take into account the following issues when developing the scheme through to completion:

**GENERAL**

- The updating of the town plan for the competition area should be finalised in such a way that it enables the new ARTS building to be carried out in accordance with the winning entry proposal. Additional building additions should also take into account the planning and townscape ideas contained in other prize-winning and purchased entries, especially with reference to the entry “Ainoa”.

- The spread of the overall footprint of the building should be studied further and consideration given to reducing the present extent of the building. Compacting the overall volume would produce benefits both internally and externally (ie. reducing distances between facilities). Correspondingly, this improvement could lead to a more visible and effective contrast in the heights of some of the massing of the building. Condensing the building area also gives the advantage of creating a more spacious green area on the north side of the building, allowing open views towards the former main building and also saving open views out from the former main building administrative wing.

- The proposed extension in front of the Main Library is too small and the use potential of the competition area is under-exploited on that corner.

**BUILDING PLANNING**

- Floor areas should be planned following the room programme; especially some areas within the School of Arts could overlap more with each other. Generally the relation between the net user areas and overall gross floor area is still not effective enough and needs further adjustment.

- A more clear hierarchy of the inner spaces should be developed.

- Internal circulation should be more structured so that main routes are clearer and orientation easier for the users.

- The dimensions of the building units should be carefully studied so that they allow a flexible future use.

- The atrium spaces of each cluster are too repetitive and similar in their present form: more thought should be given to varying the character, shape and/or dimensions of these key elements.

- The architectural treatment of the main public areas of the building needs further study and consideration to bring it more into line with the quality of the external architecture.

- The choice of façade materials should be considered further; for example, ceramic
northern entrance is a 5 metres difference in ground height, in an exceptionally tight area. The backyard character of this external space should be changed and the area planned as a shared space in which light, service and delivery traffic, together with emergency services, use the same street space. From this area should also be incorporated a good pedestrian connection to the main plaza and metro station.

× The underground parking areas have to be planned on one level only and the entry point from the west has to be relocated.

× Consideration should be given to raising the ground levels of the various external areas (service yards, squares, paths and green areas) to enable the underground parking lot to be located above the wet ground level, so saving additional tanking expenses.

× The provision of bicycle parking facilities should be studied further; consideration should be given to dispersing the parking arrangements so that spaces can be easily offered close to all the buildings’ various entrances.

UNIQUENESS

× Although the proposal establishes a well balanced and positive relationship with its neighbours, the architectural treatment of the whole complex could be developed further in a more distinctive manner.

× The overall character of the scheme has a beautiful and well-handled human scale. In its present state the architectural treatment of the scheme is still fairly sketchy and open to a variety of interpretations. The obvious references to some well-known existing solutions should be reconsidered and possibly toned down or changed, and a more individual line pursued. The flexible overall solution offers strong possibilities for achieving an even more unique and inspiring significant addition to Otaniemi.
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Opening the **Identity Envelopes**

13.1 PRIZES

**First Prize**

"**VÄRE**"

Author, copyright: VERSTAS Arkitehdit Oy

Väinö Nikkilä
Jussi Palva, architect, M.Sc., SAFA
Riina Palva, architect, M.Sc., SAFA
Ilkka Salminen, architect, M.Sc., SAFA

Assistants, Phase 1:

Milla Parkkali, B.Sc. (Architecture)
Saara Kantele, B.Sc. (Architecture)
Miguel Pereira, architect, M.Sc., SAFA
Anna Björn, architect, M.Sc., SAFA

Assistants, Phase 2:

Milla Parkkali, B.Sc. (Architecture)
Arto Ollila, B.Sc. (Architecture)
Jukka Kangasniemi, student of architecture
Katri Salonen, assistant

Specialists, Phase 1:

Veikko Karvonen, M.Sc., traffic planning specialist

Specialists, Phase 2:

Structure:
Tapio Aho, M.Sc., structural engineer, Ramboll Oy

Energy technology:
Kari Seitaniemi / Erkki Immonen, engineers
Insinööritoimisto Leo Maaskola Oy

Landscape:
Soile Heikkinen, M.Sc., landscape architect, architect M.Sc. SAFA

Traffic:
Björn Silfverberg, M.Sc., traffic engineer, M.Sc., WSP Oy

Scale model:
Pertti Parmes, Pienoismallitoimisto Pertti Parmes
Second Prize
"492700 Leap"

Author, copyright
Esa Ruskeepää Architects Ltd.
Esa Ruskeepää
Thomas Miyauchi

Team
Tero Hirvonen
Matias Kotilainen
Sasu Marila
Sanna Nordlander
Francesco Salvarani
Lauri Virkola

Structural Design
Paul Roberts, Buro Happold ApS

Energy and Indoor Climate Design
Jo Gamwell, Buro Happold ApS

Traffic Planning
Stephen Farthing, Buro Happold ApS

Landscape Design
Sune Oslev, Masu Planning ApS

Campus Planning
Jukka Viitanen, Hubconcepts Inc

Photography
Erkka Luutonen

Scale Model
Klaus Stolt

Third Prize
"stay strong sweetie"

Author, copyright
Luis Martínez Santa-Maria, Madrid, Spain

Team
Luis Martínez Santa-Maria, (Head Designer) & H-L-P
Rafael Prieto Arévalo
Antonio Monge Martínez
Azucena Sánchez Cediel
Mariana Vilallonga López-Izquierdo
Teresa Martínez López

Consultants
JG ingenieros

Scale model
Gilberto Ruiz Lopes
13.2 PURCHASES

1st Purchase “AINOA”

Author, copyright
Arkitehtitoimisto Lahdelma & Mahlamäki Oy
Rainer Mahlamäki, architect, SAFA
Ilmari Lahdelma, architect, SAFA

Team
Panu Härmävaara, architect, SAFA
Akseli Leinonen, architect, SAFA
Samps Palva, architect, SAFA
Teemu Pirinen, architect, SAFA
Marko Santala, architect, SAFA
Hanne Savolainen, architect, SAFA
Jukka Savolainen, architect
Miguel Silva, architect, SAFA
Maria Mahlamäki, translations

Structural Design
Eero Pekkari, M.Sc., Ramboll Oy

Energy Planning
Timo Rantala, Green Building Partners Oy

Traffic Planning
Pekka Kuorikoski, Ramboll Oy

Landscape Architecture
Tommi Heinonen, VSU, Arkkitehtuuri- ja vihersuunnittelu Oy

Scale model
Alphaform Oy
2nd Purchase "HIPSTERKASBASH"

Author, copyright
Arkitehtitoimisto ALA Oy
Juho Grönholm
Antti Nousjoki
Janne Teräsvirta
Samuli Woolston

Team, Phase 1
Aleksi Niemeläinen (Head Assistant)
Auvo Lindroos
Pekka Tainio
Vladimir Ilic
Julius Kekoni

Team, Phase 2
Jussi Vuori, (Head Assistant)
Erica Österlund, (Head Assistant)
Pekka Tainio
Willem Barendregt
Pekka Sivula
Haley Zhou

Landscape architect, Phase 2
MASU PLANNING /
Malin Blomqvist
Sarianna Salminen

Energy Specialist
ARUP / Paul Dunne

HVAC specialist
ARUP / Luke Stewart

Structural Design
ARUP / Rory McGowan

Traffic Planning
TRAFIX /
Jouni Ikäheimo
Esa Karvonen

Visualization
VIZARCH.CZ /
Petra Grísová
Josef Veselý
Vratislav Zika

Scale model
STOLTMODELS /
Klaus Stolt

3rd Purchase "NOLLI"

Author, copyright
Allies and Morrison Architects, London, United Kingdom

Partners, Leading team
Bob Allies
Graham Morrison
Chris Bearman
13.3 HONOURABLE MENTIONS (in opening order):

"The Butterfly Effect"

**Author, copyright** ma0 / emmeazero studio d’architectura, *Rome, Italy*

**Team**
Luca La Torre, *architect (Group Leader)*
Ketty Di Tardo, *architect*
Alberto Iacovoni, *architect*

*with*
Domenica Fiorini, *architect*
Alfredo Bueno
Elisabetta Fragalà
Alessandra Monarcha
Marcello Moroni
Lora Nurkova, *architect*

**Bioclimatic Consultant** Giacomo Ortenzi, *architect*

"ARTery"

**Author, copyright** PO 2 ARCHITECTS
Marcos Parga
Idoia Otegui

**Team**
Idoia Otegui Vicens
Ana Amo Ardura
Iñigo Paniego
Adrea Gómez
Rocio García

"TAHBAJP"

**Author, copyright** MOXON ARCHITECTS, *London, United Kingdom*

**Contact person** Ben Addy
"A*

Author, copyright  Tuomo Siitonen, Architect SAFA

Team  Henrik Ahola, Architect, SAFA
Bogdan Chernyakevich, M.A.
Tarmo Juhola, Student of Architecture
Mirkka Kaaja, Architect, SAFA
Mikko Lehto, Architect, SAFA
Hans Nevanperä, 3D-visualizer

"0073"

Author, copyright  OOZE Architects, Rotterdam, Netherlands
Eva Pfannes
Sylvain Hartenberg

Team  Maria Chiou
Mara Kanthak
Phillip MacDougall
Thomas Pearce
Augustin Roy-Verger

Sustainability consultant  Shilesh Hariharan

"STUDIO CLOUD"

Author  Manuel David Romero oRodriguez, architect, Salamanca, Spain

Team  Lea Ingold Pradel
José Luis Sánchez
Winners
1st Prize: “VÄRE”
2nd Prize: “492700 Leap”
3rd Prize: “stay strong sweetie”

Purchases
Purchase 1: “Ainoa”
Purchase 2: “HIPSTERKASBAH”
Purchase 3: “NOLLI”

CAMPUS2015 – Jury report
Open international architectural design competition for Otaniemi central campus of Aalto University
Phase 1: 5 April – 10 August 2012
Phase 2: 15 January–15 May 2013

ENTRY 176
“NOLLI”
ENTRY 135
“Ainoa”
ENTRY 075
“HIPSTERKASBAH”
ENTRY 011
“stay strong sweetie”
ENTRY 125
“492700 Leap”