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1 THE OBJECTIVE OF THE DESIGN COMPETITION

The purpose of the competition was to find an architecturally high-quality solution for the implementation of the extension of Tampere Art Museum. Another aim was to explore the museum’s spatial starting points and to make the museum more attractive and better known by means of impressive architecture. The Art Museum will be the first new public building in decades to be constructed for art in Tampere.

The competition also looked for ideas for the cityscape and the functions, in order to develop and complement the Pyynikintori Square area as a public urban space. The objective is to improve the square’s general appearance and reorganise the activities within the area of the square. Parking in the area is to be located in an underground parking facility beneath the square.

Suitable housing, retail, and office space were also to be located in the competition area. The objective was to study what would be a suitable volume of new construction to create a high-quality area in terms of cityscape and city structure. The aim was to make the solution as cost neutral as possible. The plan is to cover some of the museum’s construction costs through the sale of the building rights that will be planned in the future.

The competition looked for high-quality, impressive architecture that respects the values of the city’s structure and architecture, as well as an urban space in which the solutions for the traffic and technical factors are successful.
1.1 Competition arrangements

1.1.1 Implementation method and the organiser

The competition was an open international design competition organised by the City of Tampere. It was a requirement that at least one of the creators of a competition proposal has the right to practise as an architect in their home country.

1.1.2 Jury panel and other organisation

The jury panel included the following members as appointed by the competition organiser:

- Pekka Salmi, First Vice Chairperson of the City Council; Deputy Mayor until 12 June 2017
- Anna-Kaisa Heinämäki, Deputy Mayor
- Annikki Järvinen, Tampere Art Society, Professor, Emerita
- Ranja Hautamäki, Professor, Landscape Architect, D.Sc. (Tech.) MARK
- Taru Hurme, Planning Director, Architect SAFA
- Sakari Leinonen, Project Manager, Architect SAFA
- Outi Leppänen, Project Architect, Architect SAFA
- Taina Myllyharju, Museum Director
- Lauri Savisaari, Purchasing Manager, Director of Culture and Leisure Services

Appointed by SAFA:
- Henna Helander, Architect SAFA
- Ville Hara, Architect SAFA

To support the jury's work, the competition organiser commissioned expert evaluations on the various sub-fields and perspectives of the evaluation. The following parties were heard as experts:

- Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum:
  Tuija-Liisa Soininen
  Hannele Kuitunen

- Traffic systems:
  Ari Vandell, Planning Manager
  Timo Seimelä, Transport Engineer
  Juha-Pekka Häyrynen, Planning Manager, Public Transport

- Geotechnical and municipal engineering: Mikko Kielo, Senior Planning Officer

- Local detailed planning:
  Elina Karppinen, Head of Local Detailed Planning

- Plot and land use matters:
  Heli Toukonemi, Land Use Manager

Cost analysis was conducted by Sari Loponen, DUCO Rakennuttaja Oy.

Structural and constructability analysis was conducted by Juha Tanttu, Sweco Finland Oy.


The experts and the competition secretary were not involved in any of the decision making, and they were not eligible to enter the competition.

The technical implementation and the secretarial tasks were the responsibility of Pekka Koli, Architect SAFA.
1.1.3  Competition rules and selection of the participants

The competition adhered to SAFA’s competition rules and the ACE recommendations for design competitions (www.safa.fi). The competition programme and its Appendices have been approved by the organiser, the jury panel, and the Finnish Association of Architects Competition Committee.

1.1.4  Competition schedule

The competition started on 15 December 2016 and closed on 15 March 2017.

In connection with the competition, a tour of the current Tampere Art Museum building was given on 3 January 2017.

The competition participants were entitled to submit questions regarding the competition programme until 18 January 2017. The jury’s answers to the questions submitted by the deadline were published on the competition website on 30 January 2017.

In May 2017, the competition organiser requested, in accordance with the competition programme, that the authors of the 10 selected proposals create a scale model of their proposal. The pseudonyms of these proposals were published on the competition website. The scale models were delivered to the competition organiser by 12 June 2017. The models were purchased at a separate fee of EUR 3,000.

A public event was organised at the Tampere Conservatoire on 14 June 2017 to present the 10 proposals selected by the jury and to discuss the proposals and their scale models. Feedback from the public was recorded and passed on to the jury. Before the presentation, there was an open walking tour of the Pyynikintori Square area.

On 13 June 2017, the ten competition proposals selected by the jury were presented to the Tampere Cityscape Advisory Committee, with the feedback recorded and passed on to the jury.

1.1.5  Competition entries

By the competition deadline, a total of 147 competition entries were delivered directly or through a delivery service. The entries were listed and numbered in a random order when opening the packages, and the arrival and sending dates were also checked.

Two pseudonyms (Kehys and Tähkä) occurred twice, so those listed earlier were marked with number 1 and the later ones with number 2. A list displaying the pseudonyms of the submitted proposals was published on the competition website.

Some of the proposals were sent without the full complement of presentation materials, but the jury decided that they could still be accepted and evaluated.

Two illustrations of all of the competition entries were published on the competition website, where the public had the opportunity to view them and provide feedback on them. Public feedback was passed on to the jury.

A numbered list of the competition entries:

1  KIVIKAVERIT  2  tuoppi ja pikari  3  stilleben
4  Aatsh  5  SYKLIT  6  SYLI
7  A13581  8  ART VALLEY  9  KEHYS (1)
10  ARCADE  11  metsäpolku  12  PAASIKIVEN KANGASTUS
13  entäs Sitte  14  Amurin kattojen yllä  15  THX113876
16  siivet  17  KIILA  18  Castor and Pollux
19  UNDER ONE ROOF  20  kaiku  21  THE MIND PALACE
22  Maple47081  23  Plus  24  ARTCORE
25  TA-LO  26  TAMTAM  27  TRE2
28  PLASSI  29  Bona fide  30  HEKSA
Nimimerkit, joiden tekijöiltä pyydettiin kilpailuohjelman mukaisesti pienoismallit olivat:

14 Amurin kattojen yllä
21 THE MIND PALACE
41 TAD Tampere Art District
53 CALAMARI UNION
68 MUSEUM SQUARE
74 dogma
82 Nexus
88 Siilo
113 LOOTA
120 ARCHIMEDEAN POINT
1.2 Competition background and the design task

1.2.1 Competition area

The competition area is located in the vicinity of the city centre area of Tampere, in the city districts of Amuri and Pyynikinrinne. The actual competition area has been outlined in the Appendices. The total area to be planned is 5.4 ha. The area is located about one kilometre to the west of the city centre (i.e. from Keskustori Central Square). The competition area is split by Pirkankatu, which is a busy main collector street. On the southern side of Pirkankatu, you will find Pyynikintori Square, Heinätori Square (“Hay Square”) and Heinäpuisto Park. On the northern side of Pirkankatu, you will find the art museum area that boasts two parks: Taidemuseonpuisto and Kelloplaani.

1.2.2 Competition objectives, content of the design task, and evaluation criteria

The purpose of the competition was to draw up a high-quality, innovative plan for the current art museum area, in such a way that spatial solutions that are sufficient for the development of the museum’s activities are implemented. The aim of the new building and the area surrounding it is also to make Tampere Art Museum and the City of Tampere better known and more attractive. In accordance with the room programme, the new building for the museum will be about 4,887 gross m². The total of the current art museum plot buildings is 2,047 gross m². The overall total area of the museum buildings will be about 6,934 gross m².

The competition also looked for ideas for the cityscape and the functions in order to develop Pyynikintori Square as a high-quality, vibrant public urban space. Pyynikintori is a significant part of Tampere in terms of cultural history and cityscape. The charming square milieu must be given more polish and the square must be given a new role as part of the centre of this growing city. The buildings surrounding Pyynikintori and their retail space,
educational establishments, the sports field nearby and the new art museum will create a functional frame for the square. The square area can be renewed, taking its historical value into account. The square activities, the recreational and play areas, public transport, the taxi station, traffic and parking must be grouped in such a way that the square-like character of Pyynikintori is emphasised.

In addition, suitable housing, retail and office construction must be located on the plot of the museum’s new building, in the Heinätori and Heinäpuisto areas, and in the current parking area on the eastern side of the competition area. The objective was to locate about 16,000 gross floor m² of infill development that primarily consists of housing in the area. The purpose of the competition is to study what would be a suitable amount of infill development in the area, in order to create a high-quality overall solution (in terms of cityscape and city structure) and an architecturally successful museum entity.

The evaluation criteria for the competition proposals were as follows in the given order:
• a high-quality overall solution in terms of cityscape and city structure
• an impressive museum entity and museum block area in terms of cityscape and architecture and the natural connection of the new building to the current museum buildings
• a high-quality spatial and architectural solution for the museum entity, as well as the realisation of the functional objectives
• the development solutions for the cityscape and the functions for the Pyynikintori Square area; invigorating the area, observing the historical value of the square area, the spatial structuring of the area
• solutions regarding infill housing development and/or other construction and fitting it to its surroundings
• feasibility of the solution, and a balanced solution for the aesthetic, functional, techno-economic and sustainable development objectives.

The jury commissioned scope and cost comparisons, as well as the necessary technical surveys regarding the best proposals to serve as the basis of the final decision making.
The jury regarded the merits of the overall solution as being more important than the correctness of the sub-solutions or details.
2. EVALUATION

The jury has conducted the evaluation anonymously in accordance with the contract notice on the competition. The evaluation has been carried out according to the evaluation criteria stated in the competition programme, taking into account the objectives and planning instructions set in the programme.

2.1 General evaluation

2.1.1 General information about the competition entries

The competition task was clearly challenging. Balancing the numerous possibilities offered by the city structure on one hand, and the strong identity required by the new museum building on the other hand, and then combining these to create an integrated whole proved difficult but fruitful.

Tampere is a growing city that is continually renewing itself; a city whose core identity consists of the iconic scenery of the large, block-like red-brick industrial buildings by the Tammerkoski Rapids. The city structure of Tampere is based on clear coordinate systems, distinct topography, and the presence of waterways. New construction was to be in keeping with the local identity.

The evaluation emphasised the overall architectural approach to the art museum as well as expressing the importance of the exceptional public building as a landmark, taking possession of urban space, making use of the location in terms of city structure, and the experiential and functional dimensions of the future art museum.

Tampere Art Museum will be built as an art museum for future generations. It must be easily accessible and have adaptable spatial solutions. The proposed space arrangements for the art museums were an interesting mix of different types of spaces from open, box-like neutral spaces to quite experiential series of spaces. The competition participants were also expected to explore the functionality of the exhibition facilities and the related facilities.

The art museum’s relation to the current main building, the granary designed by Carl Ludvig Engel, was essential, especially for the public outdoor space now emerging between them. Almost without exception, the proposals connected these two art museum buildings and their functions through underground facilities, which was considered a good and functional solution also in terms of the use of the yard. Also, an important route runs between the art museum buildings to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing, and this route was not to have any visual or functional obstacles.

The building is to make the art museum more attractive and better known by means of impressive architecture. In the best proposals in terms of cityscape, the art museum took its place as a notable building at the end of three streets, empowered by the open public space of Pyynikintori Square. The jury took the view that a public building at the edge of a classic market square cannot be neutral and inconspicuous.

The proposals create urban space in very different ways. In many of them, the new art museum took up the entire plot next to the old museum, leaving hardly any public space. Some of the participants set the museum in a free and pavilion-like style in a park, but this meant it was disconnected from the overall city structure. The jury appreciated proposals in which the new building was integrated into the city structure and had a dynamic feel around it through the creation of small-scale squares and parks.

The competition also looked for ideas for the cityscape and the functions, in order to develop and complement the Pyynikintori Square area as a public urban space. The best proposals had subtle solutions, such as placing tree alleys and vegetation wisely to create new space and activity zones on the edges of the market square.

Suitable housing, retail, and office space were also to be located in the competition area, as the idea is to cover some of the museum’s construction costs through the sale of the building rights that will be planned in the future. In most proposals, infill development only played a minor role. The participants’ mastery of the basics of dimensioning in housing construction varied, the best ones providing good solutions for each of the three infill development plots.

Regarding Pyynikintori Square and infill development, the competition provided successful partial solutions, yet none of the proposals as such offered a complete starting point for further planning.
2.1.2 Originality and concept

The symbolic importance of the Tampere Art Museum is significant, not only for the museum itself, but also for the city as a whole. Tampere is a growing and dynamic city, the largest inland city in the Nordic countries, so its art museum is not supposed to play a minor role, neither in terms of the cityscape nor the content. At the same time, the art museum will be the first new building in decades to be constructed for art in Tampere.

This perspective was wonderfully realised in the best solutions. However, only a few proposals created a lasting impression with their strong form. The art museum should be a building specifically designed for this location, and preferably somehow connected to the built history of Tampere, yet without the connection being artificial or just an afterthought. Surprisingly many proposals, however, rather aimed at being neutral and modest. Also, the atmosphere of the interior was sometimes so generic that, based on the perspective drawings, you could not guess it was specifically an art museum.

2.1.3 Overall city structure

The competition area is interesting in terms of city structure. The diverse, garden-city-like structure of the Pyynikinrinne area includes small-scale, villa-style construction and, contrastingly, Pyynikintori Square with its urban Classicist blocks bordered by the streets. The grid plan of the central Amuri area can still be seen in the street network, even though the closed blocks of low wooden buildings have been replaced by modern slab blocks since the 1960s.

The competition sought solutions for the extension of Tampere Art Museum as well as ideas to complement Pyynikintori Square through infill development, with the main emphasis being on the museum’s design. Even though an ideal starting point for further planning was not found for all of the subareas, the competition provides a comprehensive picture of the area’s potential. According to the jury, the objectives set for the competition can be implemented, taking into account the area’s importance in terms of history, architecture, and landscape.

The competition shows that it is possible to develop the surroundings of Pyynikintori Square as a one of the city centre’s focal areas, in accordance with the development guidelines for the Tampere city centre. Natural starting points for the area’s distinctive character are its burgeoning cultural activities, vibrant urban culture, green connections and recreational activities linking it to the Pyynikki area and Lake Näsijärvi, and the well-functioning traffic and parking arrangements. Being the terminal stop for the tramway during its first phase and a point of transfer to other modes of transport, the role of Pyynikintori Square as a traffic node will continue to grow.

2.1.4 Internal city structure

The competition area is located in the historically and functionally diverse surroundings of Pyynikintori Square, where several different coordinate systems meet. The best proposals managed to connect the art museum with the southern end of the market square by making use of the directions of the area. Turning the coordinate system also provided a natural starting point for the arrangements for Pyynikintori Square. It is important for the cityscape to maintain a view of Pyynikintori Square from the museum.

The documents required for the competition did not include an urban context diagram, but the models requested illustrated the impact of new construction on the city structure quite well. Quite a few participants suggested locating the museum building on the site of the demolished historical block. The history of the competition area was also reflected by the large number of atrium solutions with a lush green courtyard. Even though the starting point is logical and provides much needed historical continuity to the area, it was also considered that the art museum as a major public building could also have a more independent location as the end of the existing long vistas. The proposals with a focus on the northern part of the plot remained disconnected from Pyynikintori Square and left large, vague outdoor spaces in the foreground.

The history of Amuri had led some of the participants to use rather low buildings, which resulted in placing facilities mostly in the basement or extending the building so far there was not enough open space left to meet the requirements of public construction. The low buildings often looked quite modest as part of the cityscape. As a major public building, the art museum can even be tall, but most of the multi-storey proposals had spatial solutions that were inflexible and inefficient. However, the top proposals showed that even a multi-storey solution can work.
The best proposals conveyed an understanding of the fact that the art museum will be an integral part of a series of buildings and square spaces that have high cultural-historical value. By developing the area as a whole and strengthening the connections you can create synergy between the different functions so that the whole will be more than the sum of its parts.

The high target for infill development often led to excessively tall buildings that block views and overshadow yard spaces. The best solutions showed that a large gross floor area can be located in a balanced way in the competition area, especially if infill development could also be placed on the museum plot.

The status of the old hay-weighing building in terms of cityscape must be preserved. In most of the proposals this had been well understood. The visibility of the Catholic church must be ensured regardless of new construction.

2.1.5 Museum entity

The purpose of the competition was to find an architecturally high-quality solution for the implementation of the extension of Tampere Art Museum, where the aesthetic, functional and techno-economic objectives, as well as those dealing with sustainable development, have been solved in a balanced way. The competition attracted a large number of participants even from abroad, which shows that designing an art museum building in a challenging setting was an interesting task that was bravely attacked. So almost without exception, all of the proposals give priority to the art museum building, and great effort, both aesthetically and functionally, had been put into designing this building, leaving the other competition objectives with less attention.

Roughly speaking, art museums can be divided into two main types. In the traditional model, the exhibition visit takes place from one exhibition space to another, and the exhibition spaces are halls or rooms that are separate from each other. The artworks hang on uniform wall surfaces; statues can be placed more freely in the middle of the hall. The lighting makes use of skylight. The other model with fully modifiable museum space is exemplified by the Centre Pompidou in Paris: there are no load-bearing walls on any of the floors. Exhibitions can be freely built using lightweight walls. Lighting is based on artificial light. Both of these models were successfully applied in this competition.

Although the competition documents had emphasised the natural connection of the new building with the current museum building (the granary) and with the functions, surprisingly many proposals ignored the importance of the old art museum building. The new building must not overshadow the old museum building or make it subordinate, and the old museum's front yard must also be preserved. In addition, several proposals still divided the art museum functions into different-sized, scattered spaces and building masses, even though the competition programme specifically emphasised the need to connect the facilities and functions.

The most natural entrance to the museum building is at the ground level. The proposals with an entrance at the basement level usually have a dip in front of the building that faces an unfavourable direction. The new exhibition facilities have been located in the proposals in mainly two ways. If the exhibition facilities were located beneath the foyer floor at basement level, their height could be insufficient and lighting would pose a challenge, but the connection to the old museum building was direct. If the exhibition facilities were located on the second floor, it was possible to create spacious facilities and make use of both skylight and the interesting city views. Yet in these proposals, the new facilities sometimes remained disconnected from those in the old building. The proposals with ground-level exhibition facilities were interesting. This made it possible to deliver even large artworks directly from a lorry to the exhibition space, thus saving the cost of a service lift.
It was delightful to see that quite a few proposals had paid careful attention to the logistics of the art museum building and the functionality of the facilities: with only some exceptions, the loading space / garage / settling room and a smooth route from the loading space to the exhibition facilities was taken into account. The specific aim of the competition was to develop the museum’s spatial starting points and to concentrate museum activities that have been decentralised in various locations. As the room programme was very dense, it is unfortunate that many proposals invested in impressive foyer facilities, staircases, and large glass surfaces that decrease the wall space needed for exhibition functions, being either wasted space or even harmful to presenting artworks due to direct sunlight. Some of the lower category proposals, in particular, came up with a statuesque building that neither linked in with its surroundings nor contained a sensible amount of space for its functions. Fortunately, the upper and prize category proposals included several functional and modifiable facilities for the diverse needs of modern art exhibitions. The solutions for the work facilities for personnel were also varied. The current trend for open-plan offices may not always be the best option for research and writing work that requires concentration. Several proposals had also paid proper attention to the wish of the regional art museum to have exhibition space immediately by the entrance.

Many proposals also took into account the diverse exhibition needs related to the Tampere Art Museum collection. In addition to using the old granary building, the suggested exhibition spaces included an exhibition wall or display cases in the corridor connecting the old and new building. Embedded and lit display cases would be an excellent solution for presenting the medal art collection managed by the Tampere Art Museum.

One of the key objectives of the competition was to make the museum more attractive and better known, not only with its art collections and exhibition activities, but also by means of impressive architecture. The objective of impressive architecture was approached in the proposals in a variety of ways: different kinds of massing, choice of materials, and lighting solutions. Taking this into consideration, there were surprisingly few solutions that stood out right away. The proposals included fewer landmarks than expected; you would think that a steadily growing Tampere that is becoming more and more international would attract bolder solutions. On the other hand, the entries presenting so-called “wow-factor” architecture were usually disconnected from their surroundings and functionally weak. The essential issue was therefore striking a balance between the different requirements. The best and winning entries included good suggestions with feasible basic solutions that would withstand the test of time and accommodate future needs.

A wide range of choices were presented in the competition as regards massing, or the design of construction volume. In most cases, a statuesque form led to an end result that was disconnected from its surroundings and functionally weak. Free form was, however, not considered impossible: even though an anonymous, modifiable space is ideal for exhibition activities, the art museum can also challenge art, creating suspense between the building and the artwork. The problem with the many of the tall, tower-like proposals was that the facilities were spread across several separate floors, making them less flexible. The challenge for a sprawling atrium building that is based on the area’s history is that the current park area disappears. With more compact massing, it was possible to keep the area park-like as you could build even on current traffic areas. Trendy themes, such as employing pitched roofs derived from the museum block so that the large building is structured by a folded roof shape that would give it the appearance of being smaller in scale, were not convincing. The building must withstand the test of time, and the best entries had massing that was relatively composed.

The proposals included a wide spectrum of façade materials. Many of them linked the new building to the old granary by using red brick. The solution is obvious, but works. In some cases, the red brick creates a heavy atmosphere. In many proposals, the heavy material was made lighter looking with different kinds of brick laces and reliefs. It was also common to use wood in the façades as a reference to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing. Wood worked best when used in linings or boldly as material for the load-bearing structures. The jury considered various material choices as possible. The building stock in the surroundings is diverse and does not, therefore, determine the façade material. The independence of the art museum can also be emphasised by using a material that differs from the surroundings. The materials should be durable and stable. Architecture must consider all of the finer details (e.g., the problems of using rooflights in the Finnish climate).

Image 4. Art museum building  
Image 5. Art museum plot
2.1.6 Pyynikintori Square and public outdoor spaces

The competition area includes several central and historically significant public outdoor spaces. The task was to develop these areas taking their values and characteristics into account. Another goal was to link the new art museum and the new structures in a natural and interesting way to create an integrated whole. From the perspective of public outdoor space, the competition’s special challenges proved to be the treatment of the art museum area and Pyynikintori Square.

THE ART MUSEUM AREA AND THE NORTHERN PARK AREAS

Handling the immediate surroundings of the art museum proved difficult for many participants. Several of them chose the scale of the Amuri wooden housing block as their starting point and created a large new block with the museum on the unbuilt plot. The museum buildings based on the atrium solutions paid proper attention to the trees growing in the yard of the former wooden housing block. Even though the solution based on a large block is logical, it did not always create an interesting public space or a pleasant environment. In many entries, the volume of construction was too great, leading to a cramped result. The jury appreciated entries that had Amuri’s park-like environment as the starting point and created a spacious feel around the museum. The solution was based on locating the art museum close to Pirkankatu Street and massing the museum building. The former block yard next to the art museum was thus successfully turned into a park-like green area that together with the museum yard is public space for people to share. The area’s spaciousness provided opportunities for creating a pleasant, green environment, not forgetting the opportunities for infill development.

The key task was to incorporate the northern parts with their different characters more naturally into each other. In the best entries, the surroundings of the new museum building, the yard of the old art museum, and the small parks formed a pleasant and attractive whole. Many proposals had completely ignored the Kelloplaani area and left a vague green area between Pirkankatu Street and the new art museum. It seems that bringing the new museum closer to Pirkankatu was a successful solution in this respect as well. Structuring the wedge-like area between Puutarhakatu and Pirkankatu Streets turned out to be a challenge. Many proposals had not solved the end of Puutarhakatu, leaving the parks as passive remainders of the city structure that were not smoothly connected to the whole. In the best entries, the new museum was located as a handsome end of Puutarhakatu, close to Pirkankatu, or the area was activated with a new square that was connected to Pirkankatu. These solutions created the needed end to Puutarhakatu and linked the art museum area to the Pyynikintori Square area as a whole. The relation between the old and new museum was not always sufficiently taken into account in terms of treating public outdoor space. In many entries, the new art museum was not connected to the old museum milieu in a balanced way. The jury appreciated the solutions in which the new museum and its public space naturally complemented the old museum surroundings, adding a new and interesting dimension to it.

The challenge of the competition task was the barrier effect created by Pirkankatu Street and the clear division of the area into two parts: Pyynikintori Square and the Heinätori Square area in the southern part, and the art museum and its surroundings in the northern part. It turned out that connecting these two areas in terms of city structure was a difficult task. In the best entries, the new museum successfully linked the northern part to Pyynikintori Square by being located close to Pirkankatu, adapting to the Pyynikintori Square coordinate system, and turning towards the square. The solutions that placed the art museum building further away from Pirkankatu were not as smoothly connected to the square area. Several entries had successful ideas for improving the pedestrian and bicycle connections between the Pyynikintori Square area and the art museum surroundings. In particular, developing the eastern edge of Pyynikintori Square as a pedestrian-oriented area contributed to this goal.

PYYNIKINTORI SQUARE AND HEINÄTORI SQUARE

The competition objective was to develop the Pyynikintori Square area as an entity that comprises the cityscape and the functions, taking into account the historical values of the area. This proved to be a difficult task. It was requested that the significant cultural-historical values and characteristics of the square area be taken into account, including the clear formation of space and the plantings that frame the open space. Yet many entries presented radical and unjustified reforms to the square area that did not bring any added value in terms of functions or aesthetics. The heavy construction suggested for the square and the infill development at the northern edge of the square was not considered possible. Filling the square with structures or renewing it with modern design found no support either. The best solutions treated the square with a moderate approach, adding subtle new structures. The spaciousness and empty space of the square was understood both as a value in terms of the cityscape and as functional potential. The jury would still want to see functional
improvements that are original. One proposal that stood out was one in which the northern and southern parts of Pirkankatu Street were connected to each other with an architectural shelter structure that also marked the tram stop as the art museum stop. Another successful and simple but efficient solution that occurred in a few proposals was based on doubling the rows of trees lining the square, thus creating small recreational parks at the edges of the square. Maintaining the park-like character of the square was seen as an important goal as well as compensation for the loss of Heinäpuisto Park to construction. The competition’s planning instructions suggested expanding the playground functions in the square, but this was ignored by many entries. The other needs as regards the functions in the square area were well observed, and the bus terminal, for example was connected naturally to the square area.

In addition to Pyynikintori Square, the competition area also included the small Heinätori Square with its hay-weighing building, and Heinäpuisto Park, which could be used for infill development. The historical value of Heinätori Square was well observed, and most proposals left enough space behind the hay-weighing building. In Heinäpuisto Park, many entries successfully put the emphasis on infill development along Pirkankatu, thus leaving the southern part of the area more spacious and connecting it to the Pyynikki area in a natural way. Some proposals placed either very tall or otherwise massive construction in Heinäpuisto Park or the Heinätori Square area, which was not considered desirable.

### 2.1.7 Infill development

Suitable housing, retail, and office space were also to be located in the competition area, as the plan is to cover some of the museum’s construction costs through the sale of the building rights that will be planned in the future. The conditions for implementing an underground parking facility beneath the square depend on the parking spaces required by infill development.

The competition programme stated that the targeted gross floor area for infill development is 16,000 gross floor m². The starting points for planning infill development were the options of locating it on Heinätori Square, the art museum area, or the art museum parking area along Puutarhakatu. Some of the proposals had massive construction also on Pyynikintori Square, which was considered to be an ill-conceived solution to start with.

Adapting the scale of infill development to the existing built environment within the high target of gross floor area was challenging, but the best proposals proved it was possible. The goal was best achieved by spreading infill development across several plots. The scale was best controlled by locating infill development in the museum plot as well.

Quite a few proposals did not, however, find a natural solution for infill development, so the result was either dense due to massing that was too heavy, or unsuitable for the location due to construction that was too tall.

The competition found no complete starting point for further planning of infill development, but the competition entries provide a comprehensive view of the suitable construction volume for the area, and massing as the basis for work on the local detailed plan.
2.1.8 Dimensioning and functionality

For the art museum’s additional construction, most of the proposals had dimensioning that for the most part matched the given room programme. The functionality of the entrance foyer seemed to have posed challenges: how to create a clear, inviting, impressive yet also functional reception area with foyer services and a museum shop, in such a way that the facilities do not take too much space from other (exhibition) functions.

Most proposals had paid enough attention to the challenges related to the transport and maintenance of artworks, and in almost all of the proposals, with the exception of just a few, the solutions for the logistic details required by exhibition functions from the loading platform to the doorways were practical.

For the exhibition facilities the request was, in addition to meeting the requirements of modern museum technology, also to be as modifiable as possible, both in terms of the interior walls and the height of the space. The majority of the proposals had taken the modifiability of the facilities well into account, the multi-storey proposals in particular, in which each individual exhibition space floor could be opened and closed separately according to the needs of the exhibition programme. Unfortunately, quite a few proposals had forgotten to include a large and high-ceilinged exhibition space in the room programme, even though there is a clear need for that space in the future too. Luckily, many of the proposals had also taken into account the customer’s perspective with a clear and consistent exhibition route, so that visitors do not need to go back along the same route to the starting point. In most of the proposals, the solutions for dividing the exhibition space can be specified in more detail in further planning. The solutions for work facilities for personnel can also be specified in further planning.

As a whole, the room programme of the new art museum building is moderate in the sense that the facilities geared to visitors, even if spread across several floors, still remain within reasonable limits and can thus be managed on one museum visit – this is certainly customer friendly.

2.1.9 Traffic

The traffic network solutions were mainly presented according to the initial objectives. Some proposals had missed the fact that the driving direction at Pyynikintori Square had changed. The traffic directions are determined by the tramway plans and thus fixed.

The proposals included good ideas for the public transport terminal arrangements at the square, but none of the proposals works as such as the basis for implementation. The solutions that have drive-through bus stops are better for safety in the square area than the options in which the buses have to reverse in the square area. The drive-through platforms cut through the square zone, making it important to develop the edges of the square to observe the needs of pedestrians and cyclists. Bus traffic was mainly located in the northern part of the square so as to provide a smooth transfer connection with the tram traffic. The junctions for bus traffic must not be located too close to Pirkankatu Street; instead, turning from Pirkankatu into Pyynikintori Square and turning in from the street skirting Pyynikintori Square to the square must be seen as separate events. Some participants had missed the fact that buses only have doors on one side of the vehicle.

The service traffic for the museum was easiest to arrange via Makasiininkatu Street as recommended in the competition programme. This led some of the entries to locate the museum building in the northern part of the plot, diminishing the building’s role in terms of cityscape. Combining service traffic and the future parking facility is not recommended, as these separate projects will have different schedules, and the museum must be able to operate even without the underground parking option. In addition, the lorry needed for art transport requires more height than a car in underground facilities, and providing an underground turning space increases the costs significantly. If the service traffic goes underground, the ramps must be planned carefully so as not to dominate the surroundings. It is also possible to locate the ramp or the service space on the basement floor of the extension so that it does not disturb the cityscape. In many cases, the arrangements suggested for the museum’s drop-off and pick-up traffic needed further structuring.

The ramp to the parking facility was mostly placed on Sotkankatu Street in accordance with the competition programme. The solution requires significant work with regard to moving equipment and pipes. Placing the ramps crosswise on Pyynikintori Square does not work for the cityscape, and it divides the square space. The entrances to the underground parking facility were often successfully integrated into the square structures. Directing local traffic to the southern part of the square was not seen as a recommendable solution.
The solutions for pedestrian and bicycle traffic routes were varied. There were significant differences in the functionality of the arrangements for pedestrian and bicycle traffic, as well as for bicycle traffic in the south-north and east-west directions. The routes cannot run too close to the museum building; there must be enough free space in front of the entrance. The requirements of bicycle parking must be observed in further planning.

The barrier effect of Pirkankatu Street was approached in different ways. The tram stops are raised above ground level and fenced off for safety reasons, so it will not be possible to implement the idea of shared space. Some of the proposals exaggerated the barrier effect and suggested massive underpasses to go under Pirkankatu. Multi-level solutions do not suit city centre areas, and long ramps are awkward both in terms of cityscape and functions.

The traffic solutions are analysed in more detail in the verbal evaluations of the top proposals.

2.1.10 Feasibility and overall cost-efficiency

The key factors that affect the project's overall cost-efficiency are the usability and lifespan of the building. The objective of the competition was to find a high-quality overall solution in terms of cityscape and functions that provides a flexible and up-to-date structure for diverse museum activities. Although implementing the competition programme within the given framework proved to be challenging, the top overall solutions were considered to cope with the technical and financial constraints to be faced during further development. The proposals that were deemed the best were convincing examples of the authors’ technical and problem solving skills.

Comparative scope and cost analyses have been compiled of the best entries. The comparison was based on the scope analyses submitted by the participants. The comparison focused on the renovation of the existing museum building and the new building. The cost analyses were based on the total areas. The jury also had at their disposal a cost accountant’s estimate of solutions that would increase or reduce costs. The scope and cost details were compared with the objectives of the competition programme and with each other, and they were taken into account in the evaluation if considered relevant. The scope of the competition’s room programme was ca. 4,250 m² (net), of which the current museum buildings cover ca. 1,250 m² (net). The target for the extension was ca. 3,000 m² (net), which means the projected gross area of 5,000 gross m² for the overall scope was exceeded by most of the prize category proposals.

The suggested amount of housing and retail construction varied a great deal. Fitting in 16,000 gross floor m² of infill development as per the objective on the three sites proved to be difficult but possible. Infill development was easiest and most successfully implemented in proposals that allowed housing construction on the museum plot too.

The prize category proposals were found to be technically feasible and to have structural solutions that have the potential for development, yet could be partly challenging to implement. Further planning must pay attention to choosing structures and materials that have a long lifespan and are easy to service. The space reservations for utility facilities and air raid shelters had flaws that were not considered to significantly affect the solution as a whole.
2.2 Proposal-specific evaluation

2.2.1 EVALUATION CATEGORIES

The jury evaluated all proposals in accordance with the evaluation principles outlined in the Competition Programme and divided them into categories as follows:

Prize category

14 Amurin kattojen yllä
41 TAD Tampere Art District
74 dogma
68 MUSEUM SQUARE
88 Siilo
113 LOOTA

Upper category

21 THE MIND PALACE
53 CALAMARI UNION
82 Nexus
120 ARCHIMEDEAN POINT

Upper middle category

1 KIVIKAVERIT
5 SYKLIT
8 ART VALLEY
9 KEHYS (1)
19 UNDER ONE ROOF
22 Maple47081
29 Bona fide
30 HEKSA
33 TAMPURIINI
37 HA 17
40 ATRIUM
42 AMUR
49 BUN
50 Korttelimuseo
59 DRAPERIA
64 Promenade
71 RATIO
75 IVORY
78 NOIVA
89 Passe-partout
99 Korttelipihat
101 RECUPERDO
107 THE HUB
108 12282017
123 HAVINA
128 TUKINUITTO
130 EMBRACING THE SPACE
134 BRICKSTAMP
146 JOUSI
Middle category

2 tuoppi ja pikari
3 stilleben
4 Aatsh
6 SYLI
10 ARCADE
12 PAASIKIVEN KANGASTUS
13 entäs Sitte
15 THX113876
16 siivet
20 kaiku
23 Plus
24 ARTCORE
25 TA-LO
26 TAMTAM
27 TRE2
28 PLASSI
31 KUBIK
32 QUARTZ
34 artem futurum tractabilis
35 NIKKI
36 PYYTIKKI
38 TAIDETTA KAUPUNKIIN
43 CARMEN SAECULARE
45 KVARTSI
46 NELIAPILA
47 MUOTTI
48 arki!taidemuseo
51 STÔNÔ
54 BOOTLACE
55 JÄKÄLÄ
56 Elä Pyynikki
57 ALGORITMI
58 ROOTS INTO THE FUTURE
60 Muisto
61 PLEIN AIR
62 PLASSISSA
63 NIŁA
65 AVANT-GARDEN
66 Viuhti
69 Kehys (2)
70 ANOTHER BRICK IN THE WALL
72 NUORPUU
73 Engelin siipi
76 näyttelykuva
77 murmuration
79 Vitrini
91 CAMPBELL
92 VIIVAT
93 MUUSAMA
95 LASTU
96 BOXESES
100 Arti et Urbanis!
105 LOHKOS
106 HELMINAUHA
109 KOLMIO
111 Cor
112 NOODI
114 Hakka
118 CUMU
121 Frame
122 FLOCK
126 TEAM 625429
129 YHDISTEET
131 KALEIDOSKOPE
133 WOODY
135 LYHTY
137 LÄHDE
138 8700
140 Colibri
141 ZDESIGN
142 AGORA
147 TÄHKÄ (2)

Lower category

7 A13581
11 metsäpolku
17 KIILA
18 Castor and Pollux
39 KOPPELO
44 NIETOS
52 HEI HAY
67 RUUVALLI
80 PALIKAT
81 hiekkapistempi
83 MOREENIA
84 SFUMATO
85 LATERES
86 Cultural infrastructure
87 Uunipyörä
90 SIMPUKKA
94 ROTVALLI
97 Bartholomew
98 ALCHEMILLA
102 Framille
103 ARTTELI
104 BINB
110 Tähkä (1)
115 TAIRETTA JA MUSTAA MAKKARAA
116 THE TREE TOP GALLERY
117 DIEMONDS AND RUST
119 YARDBIRDS
124 ILMATAR
125 HARJU
127 CON TEXT
132 NEXUS 3
136 REVERSE
139 FI1612
143 INCANDESCENT
144 JUST DRAW IT
145 SAA17
2.2.2 PRIZE CATEGORY

88 Siilo (1st prize)

Siilo creates an iconic form next to the old art museum. Siilo is an industrial body, a big brother to the old art museum, that clearly articulates that it is the Tampere Art Museum. This landmark building immediately leaves a lasting impression. The chosen concept, in which the shape of the old granary building is copied and stacked up in layers, may, at first glance, appear slightly contrived, but the strong formalistic idea begins to feel titillating, and the more one studies the proposal, the more convincing the idea becomes. The strong shape is also easily utilised as a logo in graphic communications. The new art museum building is positioned in a tension-creating and slightly surprising fashion by Pirkankatu Street to form the end of the Puutarhakatu Street view line. Positioning the new construction on the current traffic area preserves the maximum amount of park area. The selected coordinates successfully tie in the new extension with the directions of Pyynikintori Square as it stands at the edge of the Amuri area, making it an end point for the views from the area’s streets that can be seen from far away. The possibilities offered by the neighbouring Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing have not been utilised. The proposed compact building preserves the plot as a park-like and lush area, the outdoor space thus providing a contrast to the paved Pyynikintori Square. The building itself is a free-standing building amidst a green public space, which can be considered the most natural solution in recognition of the area’s valuable cultural environment.

The museum building is a seemingly timeless work of architecture with strong connections to the past, present, and future alike. The building is clearly designed for this particular site and assumes its place in a straightforward and unpretentious fashion. Brick as the facade material of choice works well as a reference to Tampere’s built history, and naivety is avoided with the exceptional form – the material and the form work stunningly together.

The structural and spatial solutions of the building work well. Visiting the art museum has been made into an intense experience with the different floors and spaces possessing their own distinct characters. The usability of the various exhibition floors, and the possibility of closing them off non-simultaneously, facilitates a versatile exhibition programme and provides flexibility in terms of scheduling. The basic solution for the exhibition facilities is good, but they could be more modifiable in order to avoid too cramped exhibition rooms similar to the those in the old granary buildings. The interiors open invitingly onto their environment via large glass surfaces. The biggest question that remains is how the powerful form lends itself to a relaxed art museum entrance with a café and shop on the ground floor. For now, the positioning of the facilities is natural, but as the art museum becomes more popular, the spaces may prove too small. How, within the confines of the proposed design, could this aspect of the art museum be developed? Potential future expansion of the art museum expansion should also be considered at this stage. The above-grade roof of the media room presented in the section is not seen in any of the other plan drawings. The large and quite high platform is not good for the park-like milieu.

Siilo is a clearly presented proposal, and the abstract scale model images yield an impression of the interior that is general and allusive in a positive sense. The ground-level space with a slanted ceiling is particularly powerful. However, the underground passage to the old part that runs by the media room is quite long, but it can be developed in a more experiential direction with, for example, illuminated display cases built into the wall. This assertive building can handle a lot in terms of the use of its facilities and lends itself quite well to varied expressions created with night-time lighting solutions. The use of the mezzanine as a lookout level with a coffee and bar station would add an urban dimension to the entire area. The utility service facilities included in the competition proposal’s plan material do not add up to the total area (535 m²) specified in the competition brief’s room programme, but the facilities can be implemented underground.

The treatment of Pyynikintori Square is very conservative, and it appears that the authors have not wanted to interfere with the square. The square’s historical character is preserved, and the gentle treatment enables the square to be developed by means other than those of architecture. All possibilities for future planning are left open. The bus terminal is presented with a platform solution, which is spatially efficient but requires the vehicles to reverse. The solution is more suitable for long-distance transport than local transport.

The plan did not include separate traffic network plans or diagrams, rendering it quite general in terms of traffic arrangements, which means it was difficult to evaluate them. The underground maintenance traffic is directed via Sotkankatu Street and a ramp down to the parking level. The solution requires considerable relocation of
equipment and cables as well as easement contracts between the properties. Maintenance traffic in the proposed manner seems functional and safe, but expensive. The challenging solution ties the implementation of the museum plan to that of the parking facility, which is not feasible. A better route can be found for the maintenance ramp from Puutarhakatu or Makasiininkatu Street. The ramp will, in any case, increase the museum extension's building costs.

When it comes to passenger car traffic, the drop-off sites are situated at the western end of Puutarhakatu Street, but no specific traffic solutions for Puutarhakatu are presented. The pedestrian and bicycle connections are presented in very general terms in the plan maps, and it was difficult to evaluate the solutions. The cycling route passes quite close to the museum entrance and may cause traffic safety issues. Bicycle parking is presented on Pyynikintori Square.

Infill development has been resolved seemingly effortlessly and very naturally, with no unnecessary gimmickry. Additional construction also on the museum plot decreases the pressure on the other dedicated infill development sites. The slab block building proposed for the museum plot successfully continues the rhythm of the residential buildings next to the plot. The new building is a decidedly new interpretation of the modern multi-storey buildings of Amuri and, despite the challenging location, an exceptionally successful solution that also requires the museum's designer to design the residential building next to it. The building mass on Puutarhakatu Street is slightly too heavy, but leaves reasonable scope to preserve the Catholic church as a part of the cityscape. The new building allocated to the Heinäpuisto Park in the Heinätori area fits in naturally with the architecture on both sides of Pirkankatu Street and joins the large Veljeslinna block across the street to create an urban street space. The old hay-weighing building is left with enough space around it.

### 41 TAD Tampere Art District (shared 3rd prize)

TAD is a bold proposal that is ready to assume the role of the centre and heart of an Art District area. The proposal takes a strong stand on its environment. The additional construction is positioned in a natural and confident way. Assuming the coordinates of Pyynikintori Square's western edge successfully links the main building mass as a part of the classic composition, providing the art museum with added impact. The authors have thematically analysed the city as a whole and also proposed measures arising from their concept for areas outside the competition area. This creates an interesting vision for the entire area's future.

Despite this broad approach, the proposal is carefully studied, and the presentation is praiseworthy. The facades have only two materials, aluminium and glass. As an exterior material, an aluminium grille is a cold and quite generic solution. When operating with such a severe material choice, the corner details, for example, should be delicate and carefully considered; based on the illustrations, this does not seem to be the case here. The danger is that a careless implementation would render the building too mundane. The building could well be a library, for instance, while a more distinct and individual identity was sought for the museum. On the other hand, the anonymous office-building-like appearance seems to be a conscious choice: today's art museum does not need to be overly dignified, but rather straightforward and approachable.

The entrance level has been well activated when it comes to both the interior and exterior space. The sections and interior views are tempting. The exhibition tour flows clearly, and the art museum facilities are modifiable, even if the design would benefit from an even more clearly spatial approach. The high central lobby takes up a lot of cubic metres. The interior illustration of the 3rd floor exhibition space is outstanding. There are some technical shortcomings in the proposal, pertaining to, for example, exit routes, but these are solvable.

In addition to the art museum, the TAD complex includes a residential building/apartment hotel. An apartment hotel or regular hotel might add an interesting function as an annexe to the museum building. The regulations concerning housing are so binding, however, that including housing as a part of the museum complex would likely be very difficult.

The maintenance route to the museum is proposed to enter the plot from Makasiininkatu Street, and the vehicles reverse into the plot. The solution seems functional and safe. For visitor traffic, drop-off arrangements are presented on Puutarhakatu and Mariankatu Streets.

The art terminal connecting the museum and Pyynikintori Square is a fun idea. The white "Paper planes" canopy installation forms a light, floating counterpoint to the clean-lined and assertive museum building and
gives the art museum a visible presence on Pirkankatu Street. The canopy structure also provides a strong identity for the future tramway stop. The “shared space” area on Pirkankatu Street presented in the perspective images is unfeasible due to the barrier effect of the tramway line.

The bus terminal is presented as a platform solution, which requires the buses to reverse and is better suited to long-distance transport than local transport. The terminal is left between two busy pedestrian areas, which may result in pedestrians cutting across the square, creating traffic safety issues. As the vehicles have to reverse, the bus traffic should be more clearly separated from the pedestrian area to guarantee public safety. Otherwise, the arrangements are functional, and they are not over-dimensioned, which allows the character of the square to be preserved. Vehicle access to the underground parking facility is proposed to be placed at the south-eastern corner of Pyynikintori Square. The vehicle ramp and the lifting of the terrace area at the edges of Pyynikintori are unnecessarily drastic measures. The solution brings more vehicle traffic onto narrow streets – for instance, F. E. Sillanpääkatu Street – and the entrance is quite difficult to access and to signpost. The solution has not considered the changes in the traffic directions of the streets on the eastern and western sides of Pyynikintori caused by the building of the tramway.

The east–west and south–north cycling routes intersect outside the square. Proposing a cycling route along the southern side of Pirkankatu Street between Pyynikintori Square and Mariankatu Street is likely to be accidental – the solution is not feasible from the point of view of traffic safety. Otherwise, the solution seems functional. Bicycle parking is mentioned in the text but could not be found in the plan images.

The proposed infill development is natural.

A glass building mass is always a challenge in exhibition use. Aluminium has a large carbon footprint.

74 dogma (shared 3rd prize)

Dogma is excellently positioned within the city structure, embracing Pyynikintori Square with the direction of its main facade. With this gesture, the building also creates a museum square in front of itself and forms a counterpoint to the monumental school building at the southern end of Pyynikintori. The other coordinates of the building are connected to the surrounds on the Amuri side of the museum. The relatively compact building does not fill the entire plot, but leaves enough space around itself, as is required for a public landmark building. This enables the formation of a high-quality green space.

The natural stone plinth and the brick as solid facade materials connect the new building to the old granary building. The material reference to the built history of Tampere works well. The handmade red brick gives the architecture a sense of durability. The monumental, even heavy impression has been tempered by the brick lace and white concrete that were seen in several competition entries. This steady and strong proposal would have tolerated more clean-lined exterior architecture. The interiors open onto the environment in the right places and help to activate the promising museum square. Despite the views over the historical urban space, the general image of the building is regrettably introverted. Especially in the scale model, the building mass seems somewhat heavy.

The proposal is skillfully executed and particularly beautifully presented. The poetic black-and-white perspective images are the best in the competition and, with their intense atmosphere, immediately make the proposal stand out from among the flood of competition entries. The interior architecture of the museum building is serene, even sacral, raising it above the mundane existence. The series of spaces offer variety and a fine-tuned expression. The different-sized exhibition spaces are usable in a variety of ways. A concept in which the exhibition spaces circle around a central staircase as if inside a windmill provides a reference to the old granary and links the two buildings together. The exhibition spaces are spatially interesting, but not very modifiable, unless the dividing walls are implemented as non-bearing walls, which would not seem natural for the design. The connection to the old part is accomplished through the exhibition space. The design implies some Central European references. The proposal is perhaps even a little too serious for Tampere Art Museum. What kind of a reference does the chosen architectural style provide for the visitor? How will the atmosphere in the building change when it is full of people and life?

The solutions for Pyynikintori Square are natural, albeit too conservative, and do not yield any specific added value to the area. The proposed canopy structures are light and stylish. The idea for the lighting is especially
nice: the grid formation subtly unifies the square area as a single whole. The solution could be difficult from the point of view of usability. The connection between the square and the museum building remains incomplete, and the connection between the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing and the Tampere Art Museum buildings has also not been utilised.

The bus traffic solution should have been more compact and safer for pedestrians. The bus terminal is presented with east–west running platforms, and the functionality/use of the platforms in the middle is questionable. The proposed solution requires 8 access points to the plot instead of the current two, fragmenting the tree lines framing the square, endangering the south–north pedestrian and bicycle traffic, and requiring the removal of the on-street parking at the access points. The presented platform solution, which requires the buses to reverse, is better suited to long-distance transport than local transport. The plan is based on the current street traffic directions around the square and not those outlined by the new solutions that are already being implemented.

The proposed access to the parking facility is directed via Sotkankatu Street – such a solution requires considerable relocating of equipment and cables. The museum’s maintenance traffic is proposed to access the plot and continue into the building from Makasiininkatu Street, with reversing on the street/to the street. The solution seems functional and fairly safe. As regards passenger car traffic, the drop-off arrangements are sited on Puutarhakatu Street and Mariankatu Street, but no specific turnaround driveway is presented. The east–west and south–north cycling routes intersect in the museum square, but are quite far away from the entrance. The solution seems practical. Bicycle parking arrangements are included in the presentation.

The proposed infill development is natural. The new building in front of the Catholic church is positioned in the corner of the plot, naturally defining its relationship to the neighbouring buildings. The proposal presents two new buildings on Heinätori Square. The sympathetic two-storey commercial building frames a sheltered square but, on the other hand, is placed quite close to the valuable old hay weighing building. The new construction sits well with both the neoclassical architecture of the Pyynikki area and the urban 1950s space of Pirkankatu Street.

14 Amurin kattojen yllä (Purchase)

The proposal is a controlled whole, and the assertive new museum building slots into its place in the historical block structure with an air of effortlessness. The proposal represents the group of competition entries in which the block structure of the old Amuri wooden housing blocks has been assumed as the basic solution for the art museum by filling the old museum block with the new museum building. The scale manages to be harmonious despite the contrasting approach. The internal courtyard solution is a direct reference to the history, without being naïve. The bevelled shape of the museum building pulls together the site’s two different sets of coordinates. The interior and exterior spaces are interconnected, but the ground-level wood facade could have been more clean-lined and glassy. A high-quality public space can be created between the new and old museum buildings, even if the solution remains unfinished as it is now.

The proposal is carefully examined and the presentation is clear and beautiful. The concept mimicking the rooflines of the historical wooden housing block may, at first glance, seem formalistic and contrived, but even if the idea is not necessarily apparent to the visitor, the folded ceiling makes the entrance area appealing and the interior spaces interesting. The low-rise building is not specifically perceived as an art museum but could just as well work as a library. Even though the freely composed holes in the façade are a familiar and well-used feature abroad, in this context, they serve to downscale the otherwise reserved architecture and soften the concrete exterior. Although the working principles of the integrated LED light wall are not explained in detail, the illuminated concrete is, based on the perspective images, stunning in the dark.

The museum layout is straightforward and seemingly effortless. The exhibition tour works well. Top lighting has been utilised, and the space is modifiable. There is a diversity of low and high spaces. The location of the space dedicated to the Regional Art Museum’s showcase by the main entrance is excellent.

The massive hotel building between Pyynikintori Square and Pirkankatu Street is startling. In the old local detailed plan, a regional administration building was allocated to the site, but the solution no longer feels so well-justified. The horizontal mass breaks up the architectural idea and cityscape of the square space, and a hotel and commercial building on the site in question is not functionally justified. The proposed access to the
paving facility is directed via Sotkankatu Street – the solution requires considerable relocating of equipment and cables. The bus terminal is very efficient spatially and seems to work well.

Traffic networks are presented as a diagram, but the presentation does not, for example, include pedestrian connections. The plan is quite general in terms of traffic arrangements, and it was difficult to evaluate the solutions. The museum maintenance route is proposed to access the plot from Makasiininkatu Street, and the vehicles reverse on the plot. The solution seems functional and safe. The turnaround driveway for drop-off traffic is placed in the museum square area, which presents a danger to pedestrians and cyclists. At the western end of Puutarhakatu Street, the drop-off arrangements for passenger car traffic are presented in the pedestrian/square area, where it intersects with pedestrian and bicycle traffic and poses a traffic safety problem. No bicycle parking has been proposed.

The angle in the residential building on the competition area's western corner gives the impression that the building mass has had to bend in order to avoid running into the pre-existing building. The new construction on Pirkankatu Street makes the area look relatively congested, although the long building mass along the street does create a dense and, in an impressive way, city-like street space that marks the end of the inner city's core area. The opportunities offered by yard areas are lost with the too many building masses. The hay-weighing building is left with a good position in the cityscape. The mass positioned in front of the Catholic church is of a reasonable height, but leaves the church in its shadow.

This was one of the few proposals in which the author had utilised the possibilities of renewable energy production by using solar panels on the roof.

68 MUSEUM SQUARE (Purchase)

The art museum stands as a shining beacon and landmark in the new centre for the Pyynikki area. Museum Square is a relaxed and urban art museum that is not afraid to state its presence in the city. The building is ethereal and straightforward, perhaps even already familiar from other museum buildings around the world with its references to New Objectivity, but appears very international and would be quite timeless in its stylishness. The building is confidently positioned in its environment and surrounds itself with varied urban outdoor spaces of a pleasant scale, provided that the proposed neighbouring building is executed successfully. The solution's strong reliance on the neighbouring building proposed for commercial and office use is, however, a risk. Two separate square areas are created at the sides of the museum building. The connection to the old granary building, which is left slightly overshadowed, could have been stronger; the new building seems to turn its back on the old buildings, and the space between the new and old buildings could have been utilised better as a public, connecting yard area. The relationship with Pyynikintori Square also remains a bit vague. However, the scale model made of the city structure attests to the building's ability to form a simple yet dominant presence in the urban space.

The view of the lobby is unreserved and perhaps even too trendy. The building seems very approachable, because there is no unnecessary pretence. The café terrace faces Pyynikintori Square, but its volume appears too small in the proposal. The basic exhibition space solution is good. The exhibition facilities provide a calm backdrop for the art, and their lighting is also addressed commendably in the proposal. The lack of one higher space is a concern, as is the question of how large art pieces are to be transported from the loading dock to the exhibition space. The modifiability of the clean-lined spaces is presented with distinction. The movable dividing walls make the museum quite versatile with regard to its use. The passage between the old and new buildings works well, and the idea concerning its use for exhibition purposes is feasible. A lookout area and coffee station/bar would be a nice touch on the top landing. There are some technical shortcomings in the proposal, pertaining to, for example, the exit routes and the dimensions of the green roof, but these issues are likely to be solvable.

The minimalist, translucent architecture requires an extremely accurate and high-quality implementation. The height of the building is at the very limit of what the environment can tolerate, but it does have its supporting points of reference within the surrounding building stock. The glass brick is a surprising material, but it could prove interesting when paired with the red brick. The wood structure brings warmth and posture to the otherwise intangible, ethereal architecture. A wood structure is a challenge in a high-rise public building, but if it were successfully implemented, it might be a step forward for the entire industry.
The proposal did not include separate traffic network plans or diagrams, rendering the plan quite general in terms of traffic arrangements, but the proposed solutions are based on the preliminary traffic network plans included in the source material. The museum maintenance route is proposed to access the plot from Makasiinintie Street, and the vehicles reverse into the plot. The solution seems functional and safe. For visitor traffic, drop-off arrangements are presented at the western end of Puutarhakatu Street, and the solution seems functional. The pedestrian and bicycle connections are presented in very general terms in the plan maps. When it comes to bicycle traffic to and from Puutarhakatu Street, the danger is that the cyclists would cut through the museum square, endangering pedestrians on the square. Bicycle parking is presented on the northern side of the museum, where the bicycle racks are a bit far from the cycling routes.

The treatment of Pyykinintori Square in the plan remains a bit too gentle. In all their simplicity, however, the traffic arrangements are functional. The proposed access to the parking facility is directed via Sotkankatu Street – the solution requires considerable relocating of equipment and cables. The bus terminal is presented with a platform solution that is spatially efficient but requires the vehicles to reverse. The solution is more suitable for long-distance transport than local transport.

The frame depths of the proposed residential buildings are overestimated. The clean-lined building masses are slightly monotonous and generic.

113 LOOTA (Purchase)

The green-roofed Loota is a provocative and interesting art supermarket. It defends its place as a potential art museum of future generations. At first glance, the general impression of the proposed building that takes up the entire plot is a bit too simple. However, the design entails a good deal of humour and in-depth analysis of the location, which both lightens the mood and delights as one takes a more involved look at Loota.

The entrance is easily found as it is indicated by a free-form, tongue-like canopy on an art square at the end of the Puutarhakatu Street line. The solid main door is an unusual solution, which emphasises the closed impression. The bagged brick seems like an ironic joke and a poke at modernism. However, the chosen material brings a necessary sense of a smaller scale to the box-like building, in addition to adding some roughness and humanity. The building is closed off to the outside, but the introverted aspect that at first seems like a mistake proves a considered and effective feature. The bagged white walls are a blank canvas for the art. Loota is a platform for the activities that has no need for self-assertion. The building submits itself to being moulded by the art. The question that remains unanswered, however, is whether the Tampere Art Museum is a little passive in its attitude towards its environment, or whether it will indeed attract enough attention to serve as a low-threshold, relaxed art institution. Here, the key role is played by the creative use of the building’s walls and roof as part of the art. For example, the solid, closed walls could serve as a street art gallery. The large exhibition advertisements presented in the proposal illustrations suggest that the author would allow a quite casual use of the building. The large roof surface could be utilised in a better way than what is presented.

The "closed block" with a central garden formed by the quadrangular building is a justified solution in regard to the overall cityscape and the location. The Loota configuration implies echoes of the old block structure of Amuri, and the large, clean-lined shape of the building is characteristic of Tampere. The outdoor spaces are presented in quite general terms, but implementing the series of squares according to the proposal is feasible.

The layout plans are presented in an undetailed way. The solution is somehow reminiscent of the Didrichsen Art Museum in Helsinki. The hall-like exhibition space is easily modifiable. Opportunities for top lighting have not been utilised in a way that would allow the wall to the atrium to be closable. As it is, the lighting of the exhibition space is challenging, especially as the evening sun shines directly into the building. The building relies on the service lift only, which is a questionable solution in terms of accessibility to all. The hand-drawn aerial image is a nice touch. The perspective images portray a beautiful atmosphere and help us to understand the otherwise quite complex approach.

The museum facilities are mainly located on the ground level, which brings significant advantages in, for instance, transporting large pieces of art. The space is technically and functionally easy in regard to setting up exhibitions. The fact that the building does not quite fit into its plot could easily have been solved by, for example, adjusting the size of the atrium. The utilisation of space is very economical, and the proposal has one of the most efficient layout solutions in the competition.
The proposal did not include separate traffic network plans or diagrams, rendering the plan quite general in terms of traffic arrangements, but the proposed solutions are based on the preliminary traffic network plans included in the source material. The maintenance route to the museum is proposed to enter the plot from Makasiininkatu Street, and the vehicles reverse into the plot. The solution seems functional and safe. For visitor traffic, drop-off arrangements are presented at the western end of Puutarhakatu Street, and the solution seems functional. The pedestrian and bicycle connections are presented in very general terms in the plan maps, and the solutions were difficult to evaluate. Bicycle parking is presented both on the square and in the museum area.

The solutions for Pyynikintori Square are standard. The bus terminal is presented with a platform solution that is spatially efficient but requires the vehicles to reverse. The solution is more suitable for long-distance transport than local transport. The changes in the traffic directions of the streets caused by the building of the tramway have not been taken into account in the solution, as a left-turning lane for buses/vehicles coming from the east cannot be implemented and, without such a lane, a left turn cannot be allowed. The taxi traffic unnecessarily blocks the connection to the bus terminal. The proposed access to the parking facility is directed via Sotkankatu Street – the solution requires considerable relocating of equipment and cables.

The matter of infill development has not been solved in a credible manner in the plan, and the proposal is almost solely based on an exceptionally deep-framed, 25-storey tower building. A building of such height is completely impossible in this area. In a plan that relies so heavily on a single building, the building’s layout should have been presented on at least a diagrammatic level, as it is very challenging to create even passable apartment layouts in such a deep frame. The facade becomes lighter towards the upper floors of the tower, which manages to make the disproportionate building interesting. With this mammoth, the Puutarhakatu Street view line would definitely get an end point that could not be missed, but is a residential building the right solution for such a backdrop?
2.2.3 UPPER CATEGORY

21 THE MIND PALACE (Honorary mention)

A lyrical proposal in which elements perceived as separate from each other are placed freely within the park, as is the current museum building. The design creates a strong tension between the building masses, akin to a stone garden. The composition of several pieces, however, manages to overshadow both the old granary building and the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing. The main mass sits very close to Pirkankatu Street and closes off the end of Puutarhakatu Street, which has served as an open view axis in the urban space. However, the art museum is a building of such significance that the solution is justified.

The new museum building is related to the old granary building without resorting to mere imitation. The reserved character of the facade lends the simple building mass a strong presence. The particularly beautiful black and white presentation technique is a testament to the author’s ability to turn the demanding solution into a well-implemented end result. The weakness of the proposal is its hermetic nature – what kind of added value does the building bring to its environment, and how does it activate the street space?

The versatile exhibition spaces are amongst the best in the competition and enable a variety of exhibitions and ways to hang works of art. The inherent danger in the spatially rich composition is a potentially confusing and maze-like exhibition tour. The requirement of a high exhibition space has been addressed. The spatiality entails references to several well-known art museums.

The perspective images are rough and undetailed, but are able to relate the mood the author has sought to create. A visit to the building would definitely be a powerful and interesting experience. Even though no two spaces in the proposal are the same, the design seems to tie in the whole with the controlled palette of materials. Despite the very unusual rooms, the whole forms a functional series of spaces.

The proposal did not include separate traffic network plans or diagrams, rendering the plan quite general in terms of traffic arrangements. The art museum’s maintenance traffic is directed via the parking facility ramp, thus sparing the ground level area from the road connections required by maintenance traffic. The solution seems functional and safe. The solution is challenging, however, as it ties the implementation to the uncertain underground parking facility project for the square. Implementing the solution would be very expensive, as the tunnel intersects twice with the tramway tracks and the subterranean structures on the northern side of Pirkankatu Street. With regard to passenger car traffic, the proposal places the museum’s drop-off traffic on Puutarhakatu Street, proposing a turnaround drop-off area on the street that intersects dangerously with a main cycling route. Otherwise, the solution seems functional. The east–west and south–north cycling routes intersect outside the area. The proposed cycling route arrangements are feasible, but intersecting with the drop-off area causes traffic safety issues. No bicycle parking has been proposed.

The solutions proposed for Pyynikintori Square are natural, with the exception of the canopy that severs the square space. Access to the parking facility is proposed to be directed via Sotkankatu Street – such a solution requires considerable relocation of equipment and cables. The playground, which requires a high fence around it, has been solved in a particularly commendable way. Moving the historical, semi-circular hedge northwards creates enough space for the playground, while also ensuring the integrity of the horseshoe-like shape of the square. The bus terminal is presented as a spatially efficient platform solution which requires the buses to reverse and is better suited to long-distance transport than local transport.

The infill development is presented in quite approximate terms but seems natural. A building mass that is divided into several separate parts is not the most efficient of solutions.

82 Nexus (Honorary mention)

Nexus is a sculptural non-building in the park. The surprising external shape of the building resembles a seashell, and from the bird’s eye view, seems detached and even heavy. The organic basic solution is reminiscent of the nearby Metso library building. The eye-level perspective images show the advantages of a low-lying building. The access to the roof makes for a relaxed whole. The design constitutes a joining link where streams of people meet. The museum’s main entrance is placed in a central location, at the Pirkankatu end of...
the building, to attract people to access the very approachable wood-and-glass art museum. However, the museum building is let down by its non-urban aspect. The organic expression of the building and the nature of the park are more indicative of a national park visitor centre than a cultural building for a growing large city.

The art museum’s spaces open onto their environment in the direction of both the old museum buildings and Pyynikintori Square, thus activating the yard space. The interiors yield interesting vistas outside, and the upper floor has access to a roof-top terrace that would work quite well, especially in the summer. The functions have been placed naturally. The sculptural main staircase leads to an exhibition space that seems somewhat dull and is not presented in the perspective images. The exhibition space seems quite well divisible and modifiable, but the sufficiency of the room height is questionable.

The museum’s maintenance traffic is proposed to access the plot and enter the building from Makasiininkatu Street, with the vehicles reversing on the street/to the street. The solution seems functional and fairly safe. As regards passenger car traffic, no specific drop-off arrangements are presented, but this would presumably be accommodated by Puutarhakatu Street, although no designated drop-off area has been indicated.

The solution for the pedestrian and bicycle route and the crossing of Pirkankatu Street remain somewhat unclear in the plan map, but the issue is well-presented in the traffic network diagram – in general, the proposal’s presentation of the traffic networks for various modes of traffic is good. The east–west and south–north cycling routes intersect outside the museum square. Ample bicycle parking is presented on workable sites.

The immediate surrounds of the art museum are fragmented and do not form a clearly-defined public space. The history has been replaced by a conceptual approach. The arrangements proposed for Pyynikintori Square are too busy, and the proposal could have drawn more influences from the classical history. The square plan tries to incorporate too many motifs, which are interesting as such but too copious in this context.

Access to the parking facility is proposed to occur from Pyynikintori Street on the western side of the square. The connections and access to the parking facility are presented and placed well. The solution facilitates the development of pedestrian and bicycle connections in the north–south direction with no interruptions by motor vehicle traffic from the square area. The solution has not taken into account the changes in the traffic directions of the streets caused by the building of the tramway, resulting in motorists coming from the east having to either drive around the square or use F. E. Sillanpäänkatu Street to access the underground parking, since left-turning lanes from the east cannot be accommodated on Pirkankatu Street. Placing the access at the south-eastern edge of the square area might solve this problem. The new routing of F. E. Sillanpäänkatu Street would apparently eliminate the parking spaces in front of the school. The proposed geometry for the street seems unworkable.

For the bus terminal, the plan proposes platforms that run in a south–north direction, and access to them is achieved via Pyynikintori Street on the western side of the square. The changes in the traffic directions of the streets have not been taken into account in the solution, as a left-turning lane for buses/vehicles coming from the east cannot be implemented and, without such a lane, a left turn cannot be allowed. As far as utilising the space, the proposal is efficient, but the space reservation for the street running along the western side of the square should be increased to accommodate two-way traffic. If buses only leave and arrive at the terminal to and from the west, the solution would probably work.

The infill development seems sporadic in the site plan, but the clean lines of the architecture presented in the perspective image calm down the whole.

53 CALAMARI UNION

The placement of the museum extension is natural: it aligns itself with the historical block structure on the eastern side and protrudes slightly from the line of the blocks along Puutarhakatu Street. The high and compact building mass preserves the park-like nature of the site, and the diagonal line of the wall leads the eye towards the Amuri Museum of Worker’s Housing, somewhat surprisingly, between the old granary building and former janitor’s house.
The sculptural extension is very high and threatens to overshadow the granary building. As the exterior material, zinc gives the building a grand, solid look, but also delivers a body that is disconnected from its environment.

In a high building mass, the spaces are divided into several separate floors, which is a problem in terms of utility when it comes to office facilities, for example. The office facilities are rather basic in other respects as well – the entire staff cannot work in the same room. The flow of the exhibition tour is clear, and the double-height spaces connect the separate floors in a well-functioning fashion. The maintenance traffic is not workable, as it intersects with visitor traffic. The statuesque space on the highest floor is impressive. The high space enables the exhibition of quite large works of art. The atmosphere in the perspective image of the lobby is cold and clinical. The emergency exit is not workable, but this is easily fixable.

The maintenance traffic to the museum is proposed to be directed via Makasiiininkatu Street to a ramp on the museum plot leading under the building. The adequacy of the length of the ramp for dealing with the height difference is questionable. With regard to passenger car traffic, the drop-off arrangements are proposed to flow via Puutarhakatu Street, and the drop-off area is presented to the west of a main cycling route, thus creating an unnecessary traffic-safety issue between drop-off traffic and pedestrians as well as cyclists. The continuity of the east–west main cycling route around the square to the south of the building is rather poorly addressed, and the danger is that cyclists would continue straight through the square, passing in front of the entrance and endangering pedestrians in the yard area. The same problem also applies to the continuity of the pedestrian and bicycle route travelling from the south to the north, as the danger is that people using the route will also use the front of the building as a thoroughfare. The distinction between the public area and the museum plot should be emphasised. No bicycle parking is presented.

The placement of the art museum is natural, but the building spreads so widely that it covers the entire museum park, even though nearly all of the facilities are placed underground. The solution leaves no room for future expansions.

The sculptural visor clearly, albeit rather obviously, denotes the location of the entrance. The triangular shape is reminiscent of 1960s religious buildings. The shape works best when viewed from the ground level; in the scale model, the mass mostly comes across as a low warehouse. The material choices are cold and foreign to the surroundings, and the perspective images fail to demonstrate whether they would work by means of providing contrast.

Nearly all facilities, including foyer services, are located in the basement. The connection to the old granary building is functional. The functions surrounding the centrally placed exhibition space are awkwardly positioned in places – for example, the museum shop is, for all practical purposes, mere corridor space. Top lighting and modifiability have been accommodated extremely well, although the dividing walls that drop down from the ceiling break up the space quite intensely, rendering a slightly heavy mood. However, the proposed spatial idea is original and insightful. The Regional Art Museum’s exhibition space is functional. The auditorium steps provide a relaxed sitting area and facilitate varied events, but the large foyer has a lot of unused space. The mood in both the exterior and interior illustrations is slightly rubbery – the building could perhaps do with some warmth and materiality, and the proposed rough concrete floor already adds a nice touch to the spaces.

The maintenance access to the museum is proposed to enter the plot from Makasiiininkatu Street, and the vehicles reverse into the plot. The solution seems functional and safe. For passenger car traffic, drop-off
arrangements are presented on Puutarhakatu and Mariankatu Streets. The solution seems practical. The east–west and south–north cycling routes intersect on the clearing close to the museum entrance, creating potentially dangerous situations for pedestrians walking close to the entrance and in the yard area. The danger is that the cyclists travelling between the south and north will use the eastern side of the building as a shortcut. The distinction between the public area and the museum plot should be emphasised. Bicycle parking is not presented.

The solutions proposed for Pyynikintori Square are standard, but well-functioning. The plan has made the most of the changes in the coordinates. The graphic presentations of the materials and landscape architecture are promising. The proposed access to the parking facility is directed via Sotkankatu Street – such a solution requires considerable relocating of equipment and cables. The bus terminal is presented as a platform solution, which requires the buses to reverse and is better suited to long-distance transport than local transport.

The infill development is schematic. The comb-like building along Pirkankatu Street leaves only small yard spaces between the teeth of the comb.
2.2.4 UPPER MIDDLE CATEGORY

English translations of the evaluations have been made by proposal, only for the proposals submitted in English.

8 ART VALLEY

The art museum and the residential building on the museum plot have been integrated into a single well-knit whole, achieving a balanced end result and decreasing the pressure on the other residential development plots. The development sits naturally in its environment, with due consideration to the historical context.

The proposal is skilfully and professionally executed, and the solutions are carefully examined. The new extension does not exude an atmosphere of a public construction or of an art museum; the building could also easily be a high-quality office building. Here, however, this is not disturbing, but rather makes the art museum come across as a relaxed and approachable building in all its ordinariness.

The flow of the exhibition visit is divided over quite a few floors, making for a long tour. The top floor mainly serves as a place for admiring the views. Some of the blocks laid on top of each other could well have been closed, which would make the hanging of the art easier.

The semi-circular shape of the southern end of Pyynikintori Square could have been preserved. The new strong diagonal line in the south does not lead anywhere, but just points towards a single residential building.

The infill development has been studied down to the level of floor plans. The side passage solution provides privacy for the museum area, but, on the other hand, the massive art wall is quite severe during the daylight hours, when no content is projected onto it. The solution could have tolerated a less uncompromising approach.

The close connection of the residential development and the museum would bring added challenges from the point of view of implementation. Furthermore, the functions and facilities included in the museum’s room programme spill out onto the residential building’s side.

19 UNDER ONE ROOF

The art museum’s building mass is wide but sits naturally in its environment and, with the aid of the diagonal line, also directs attention to the Amuri Museum of Worker’s Housing, integrating it as a part of the whole.

As a gesture, the shape made up of variations of the existing museum building’s outline is a bit formalistic, yet the rough industrial look is pleasing. The large glass surfaces create a connection between the two parts. The open square that remains between the museum buildings appears to deliver good tension and a pleasing scale. The diagonal orientation has also been utilised in the outdoor spaces. The facade facing Pyynikintori Square is completely closed due to the concept chosen, which is a design error.

There is a separate entrance to the multipurpose facilities, which makes the separate use of the facilities more convenient. Finding the auditorium entrance is made easier by the way the building opens up considerably towards the west. The solution is peculiar, however, as the west side of the building faces the neighbouring residential building’s backyard. The large glass surfaces in the exhibition facilities are challenging. The modifiability of the large, hall-like space is well presented. The ground-level maintenance facilities are divided into two parts, with only an outdoor connection between them.

The proposed infill development on the northern edge of Pyynikintori Square is a surprising, but plausible solution. The treatment of the square itself in the proposal is quite cursory.
A well-examined and clearly presented proposal, in which the new art museum extension is coupled with the old museum building by means of the material choices and the shape of the roofline. The author has had the courage to trust a single idea, which holds the whole together. The single-material approach works well, and the brick exterior brings a sense of scale to the large building. The loggia circling the ground floor and the vast covered outdoor spaces are not always a practical solution in our climate, as they can easily make the interior quite shady. The roof-top terrace might also be of little use, and it would be more natural to place the outdoor spaces at ground level.

The art museum sits relatively easily in its environment, though the eastern side of the building is not aligned with the building on Saarikuja Street. Raising the new extension on a pedestal is a mistake that isolates the building from the surrounding urban space. On the ground level, there is only a narrow channel between the new and old parts, which, for all practical purposes, severs the unimpeded connection to the Amuri Museum of Worker's Housing. The ramp on the northern side is a hulking presence in the urban space.

The ground level mainly includes entrance functions, and the exhibition facilities are located underground. This makes for a practical connection to the collection exhibition, but the new building is stuck with the role of an entrance pavilion. The mood in the illustrations is promising: the building appears dignified but relaxed at the same time.

The arrangements for Pyynikintori Square seem over-dimensional. A simpler structure would preserve the square’s historical character better.

The massing of the residential construction is clumsy. The diagonal lines are apparently intended to be a consideration of the existing building stock. In the residential building on Heinätori Square, the downwards widening building mass is likely the product of a large targeted gross floor area. It is difficult to place functional flats in such a wide mass.

The compact art museum sits confidently in its environment and opens out onto the surrounding urban space through glass walls, thereby activating the space. The kiosk building along Pirkankatu Street could well have been taken down.

The proposal is carefully studied and clearly presented. Both the scale model images and the axonometric images are very illustrative. Despite the clean lines, the proportions of the building seem clumsy and massive. The high roof lantern resembles a theatre stage tower. Expanding the former janitor’s house is a surprising solution.

The layout plans are cursory in a pleasant sense and have an effortless air. For the ground-floor plan, it would have been advisable to present the surrounding ground-level arrangements. The exhibition tour is clear and the spaces are quite modifiable. The glass walls in the exhibition facilities are a challenge. The interior illustrations have a promising atmosphere. The emergency exit route does not work, but this is easily fixable. The lift popping out of the second-floor maintenance unit seems to be a mistake.

The solutions for Pyynikintori Square seem disproportioned, with the ramps leading underground. It would have been advisable to arrange the bus traffic more efficiently so as to leave more square space for other uses and to better preserve the square’s classical character. The infill along Pirkankatu Street seems heavy. From the point of view of lighting conditions and heating economy, a building with walls made entirely from glass is not the best possible solution. Bicycle parking has been accommodated well.
64 Promenade

The simplicity of the concept makes the whole pleasantly calm. The new art museum extension, which is divided into two separate building masses, and the old part are connected with ease via the museum square. The varied openings in the walls add interest to the simple building. In the perspective illustration, the museum appears interesting, which is not the case in the technical plans. It is as if they represented a completely different proposal.
The infill development is placed naturally, and infill has even been fitted onto the museum plot.

The idea of an architectural promenade is a promising starting point and is reflected well in the facades as well. The division of the new museum extension’s room programme into two separate building masses, both of which have a very small basal area, leads to weaknesses from the point of view of function. For instance, the museum shop should preferably be located on the ground level, where it is more easily accessible. The floor plans are partially reduced to mere space diagrams, as the functions allocated to the spaces are only expressed with text, such as “library” by way of an explanation for an open space. An art museum needs two separate exit routes, which does not relieve the already cramped layout. The mood in the interior illustration is restful.

The concept is divided into several parts, which is not a very economical solution when it comes to costs and heating economy.

The solutions proposed for Pyynikintori Square are standard, but well-functioning. The frame depth of the residential infills is far too great.

101 RECUPERDO

The art museum is situated on the correct spot, but it is too wide and resembles a supermarket building. The small slant does not work as an impact feature, and it would have been preferable to design the building as a boldly brutal hall with no attempt to specifically refine the shape.

The grid motif on the facade is too sparse to add texture and looks clumsy. The architecture would have been well served by developing it more towards the direction of a rough art warehouse and by packing the spaces more efficiently in order to give the building mass more posture.

The exhibition space is clean-lined and modifiable, emphasising the art as the main feature. Its location on the ground level makes it easier to exhibit large pieces. The interior illustration does not yield a tempting image. Top lighting has been taken into account. The massive double staircase only leads to a small media room.

The arrangements for Pyynikintori Square are sketchy. The infill development solutions are bizarre. The suburban character of the point blocks along Pirkankatu Street is only slightly redeemed by the interconnected ground floor. The greenhouse is a peculiar idea on this scale. The tower buildings on Puutarhakatu Street have no scale.

107 THE HUB

The relaxed and sweeping character of the proposal is appealing, but it is also the proposal’s failing, reducing the design to a too schematic representation. The layout could have been developed further and made more clearly defined, which would have created a more credible impression. For example, the office facilities are not workable as presented, and some of the spaces are only accessible through a long corridor. The exterior material is a natural choice, and a certain playfulness reduces the heaviness of the brick.

The art museum seems to be still finding its place on the plot and is not supported by the existing city structure. The building is relatively compact and clean-lined. The connection to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing is also clear.
Access from both the south and the east has led to a disproportionately large foyer. The exhibition spaces receive ample top lighting, and the space can be divided in several ways. The illustration of the exhibition space is promising. The basement is hallway-like.

Underscoring the diagonal line of Pyynikintori Square serves well to tie in the various functions, but the historical motifs have been erased. The bus stops should be turned 90 degrees to face Pirkankatu Street.

The proposed infill development is cursory and too high.

The pellucid art museum offers a framework for a straight-forward, but convenient artistic experience. The L-shaped new building defines a functional open square in front of the building, through which the art museum is accessed. The entrance is therefore not positioned by the open area created at the end of Puutarhakatu Street, but at the crook of the building. The building remains slightly distant when viewed from Pyynikintori Square – it could be perceived as a somewhat reserved, mute box. A completely enclosed ground floor at the junction of two square areas may even be considered a design error. The exterior materials of ethereal, dimmed glass and the glued laminated timber that delivers rhythm to the glass surfaces in both the pilasters and closed parts give the building a pleasant but, when used on the proposed scale, somewhat dull aspect. On the other hand, the timber structure brings some necessary warmth to the otherwise austere architecture.

The tube-like ground-level connection to the old museum building is unnecessary. However, it can easily be removed, as a functional underground connection has also been proposed. The foyer facilities have glass walls and open up to the surroundings.

The layout is very clear and makes the challenging design task seem quite easily solvable, which has not been the case for the majority of the competitors. The exhibition facilities are brilliantly modifiable. Top lighting has been well considered, even overly so, as it takes up half of the exhibition hall’s cubic volume. The office facilities could easily be arranged in a more casual manner.

The organic design for Pyynikintori Square does not sufficiently accommodate the historical environment. The infill development is very schematic.

The graphic presentation of the proposal is exceptionally difficult to interpret, which makes the evaluation difficult but, surprisingly, also rouses curiosity and a desire to understand what on earth is going on in the images. The take is very conceptual in comparison to the Finnish, rational design approach. The premise of the design is far-fetched, and it seems that the author has tried to make excuses for the rambling, complicated architecture.

The proposal lacks any materiality and focuses on the form. The art museum embraces the south, which is a good direction, but does not sufficiently take the old buildings into account, simply leaving them aside.

The layout arrangements are practical. It would have been advisable to group the scale patterns so that they would not take up all of the room in the floor plans, making them difficult to read. The perspective illustrations are presented as line drawings, which does not assist the viewer in evaluating the mood. The museum tour is arranged as a blind alley, which means that visitors leaving the exhibition have to traverse the same rooms that they toured on their way in.

The arrangements for Pyynikintori Square have been resolved within the confines of the overall concept, and they are over-designed. However, bringing daylight into the parking level is a nice gesture, which shows that the authors have applied themselves to the task with far more empathy than the majority of the competitors.
The infill development is restless and scattered. A little less effort would suffice, and new construction should be examined as a part of the whole for the entire city and not approached on the terms of design alone.

130 EMBRACING THE SPACE

The art museum’s atrium solution is positioned naturally and ties in the old buildings on the eastern side of the museum square as part of the composition. In principle, it is possible to preserve some of the valuable trees.

The exterior view is quite serene, even solemn, and the beautiful building would also work well as a cemetery chapel. The roofline lends a much-needed relaxed air to the reserved look. The wooden lamellae placed at varying angles add interest but are structurally challenging, and they are carried partially into the ground floor, making the building appear as if it had sunken into the ground.

The layout has been designed with skill and clarity, which attests to the author’s expertise. The flow of the museum tour is exceptionally clear, without appearing schematic. The top lighting solution is interesting. The exposed roof rafters add interest to an otherwise calm space.

Framing Pyynikintori Square with a canopy is a somewhat heavy measure. In Finland, there is little need for protection from the sun, but the solution does acknowledge the classically simple geometry. The bus stops should be turned 180 degrees.

At first glance, the infill development seems to have been resolved without much thought by multiplying the same point block design. Upon closer examination, the solutions are revealed to be insightful. The point blocks are efficient, and connecting them by the corners along Pirkankatu Street is enough to give the solution a look suited for the city centre, avoiding the suburban character typically associated with point blocks. The ideas concerning the ground floor are very interesting. The variation of building mass height could be bolder.

Infill development with point blocks is easily implemented in phases and also appeals to the developers.

134 BRICKSTAMP

The art museum pushes uncomfortably close to the nearby buildings and blocks the connection to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing. However, the massing does accommodate the old buildings and integrates them as part of the composition. With better placement, the fine art museum design would have worked better. In the future, the authors should put more effort into analysing the city structure and outdoor space arrangements, as they clearly do possess the architectural skill.

The clean-lined building mass is calm, though it would benefit from a more compact approach. The empty atrium in the middle of the building is shady and would not be a pleasant space in our climate, and no functions are allocated to the space – however, the solution does add more exterior surface. The brick is a natural choice, though it does emphasise the heavy mood. The composition of the facades is skilful.

The entrance to the museum is accessed through a pit, but the exhibition facilities have been lifted to the upper floors, which is a cumbersome solution. The ticket sales area is cramped, and the actual museum foyer is located next to it. The museum shop is strangely hidden in a separate space behind the ticket sales counter. A monumental staircase rises up to a glass wall, leading nowhere. The staircase leading to the exhibition facilities suddenly takes a 180-degree turn. The flow of the exhibition tour itself, however, is clear. The shape of the spaces is pre-defined, and they are not modifiable. The connection to the old granary building is apologetic. The perspective illustrations are the best yield of the proposal and manage to convince the viewer of the beauty of the otherwise seemingly heavy building.

The bus stop canopy on Pyynikintori Square is heavy. A solution where the vehicles are set up in queues is not efficient. Otherwise, this subarea has been left unexamined. The frame depths of the infill development are unrealistically narrow. The building along Pirkankatu Street awkwardly covers the old hay-weighing building.
The art museum wraps itself around a multiform courtyard and is too rambling. The courtyard opens out towards the old granary building, activating the urban space between the two buildings, but an important corner by the end of Puutarhakatu Street is left with no function. The graphic presentation is reminiscent of naïve art and is among the best in the competition, but the style does not make reading the plans easier. The clearly defined massing calms down the diverse architecture.

The exhibition facilities are divided across two separate floors as well as to the basement. Toning down the design of the courtyard would serve the exhibition activities better. The glass clerestory windows to the south and west do not work. The maintenance arrangements are under-dimensioned.

The reasoning behind the changes to Pyynikintori Square’s road connections are understandable from the point of view of calming down the front of the public buildings. However, the solution is daring. The new trees do not support the historical urban space, and the canopy is too heavy.

The infill development is presented in cursory terms. Focusing the infill on the Heinätori area alone leads to too high masses. The infill development should have been spread out over a larger area.
2.2.5 MIDDLE CATEGORY

English translations of the evaluations have been made by proposal, only for the proposals submitted in English.

4 Aatsh

The proposal takes a bold approach by interweaving the area’s elements and intensely creating urban space around itself. The unprejudiced solutions are surprising, but interesting. The Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing has been incorporated well. The art museum seems larger than its size, and a monumental square forms in front of the building, as the entrance is placed on the northern end of the plot. In our climate, the practicality of an outdoor auditorium that descends towards the north raises doubt.

The exterior architecture of the art museum is light and pavilion-like, but the impression that comes to mind is more of a huge day care centre than that of an art museum. Even though the area has a long tradition of wood construction, the architecture seems foreign in places. The gestures are a bit too bombastic. The outdoor spaces could have been utilised to integrate the old museum building as a part of the whole.

The foyer spaces are in close contact with their environment, making the museum easily approachable. The museum tour flows well, though the long ramps would work better in a larger museum building.

The proposal applies commendable attention and care to the planning of Pyynikintori Square, but the entire square has been redesigned without utilising the area’s history. It is a bold idea to raise the square onto a deck above the bus terminal, and implementing the facilities below a deck as pleasant spaces would be challenging. Access to the parking facility has been placed on the eastern side of Pyynikintori.

The infill development bears down on the old hay-weighing building, but leaves the Heinäpuisto area undeveloped. The playground along Puutarhakatu Street has not been taken into account. The width of the building mass would cause problems in the lower levels.

15 THX113876

The new art museum remains detached from the old buildings due to the long distance caused by the maximum gradient of a seemingly unnecessary monumental ramp. The ramp regrettably blocks the connection to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing. The whole is scattered and confusing.

The outdoor spaces are not clearly defined but have been reduced to shapeless lawn areas. In the perspective images, the needle-like building remains anonymous and detached from its site.

A large proportion of the facilities are placed underground. Yet, the connections to the old museum building are long. The formalistic pitched-roof motif in the section of the foyer makes a large part of the floor above the foyer unusable.

The treatment of the square with a sloping deck is a drastic move, and the presented material is unable to convince the jury of the benefits of such a solution.

The zigzagging building mass on the Heinätori area is formalistic. From the plan material, it is difficult to make out what is a part of the building and what is just a canopy. At the very least, it is not possible to place residential flats at such tight angles to each other, as flats need to receive natural light and open up towards their environment.

27 TRE2

The deviating coordinates of the art museum building raise questions. Despite the lowness of the building mass, it appears quite large and heavy. The old granary and the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing are left unheeded.
The shape of the building is reminiscent of more mundane buildings. The facades are presented in a quite cursory way.

The flow of the museum tour is clear, but nondescript. The whole remains plain.

The pavilion on Pyynikintori Square cuts the square space in an unfortunate fashion. Otherwise, the solutions are standard.

The frame depth of the residential buildings is unrealistic, and the new building on Puutarhakatu Street pushes too close to the existing buildings. The residential building on Makasiininkatu Street is over-dimensioned and does not fit into its environment.

### 32 Quartz

The art museum falls easily into the non-defined coordinates of the old block structure but remains detached from the old granary building, although the site plan seems to create a composition of three cubes.

The new museum building seems larger than its actual size. The art museum gives off the impression that it could be located anywhere – a relationship with the site is missing. The treatment of the square spaces is quite approximate.

The interior is spacious and the top floor easily modifiable. The framed views of the surroundings through the cuts in the facade could be interesting.

The plan for Pyynikintori Square is confusing and does not reassert the square’s classical character. The residential building’s frame depths are unfeasible for housing, and the height of the tower building exceeds what the surrounding area can tolerate.

### 54 Bootlace

The serpentine shape of the art museum is threatening and alien to its environment. The perspective illustrations do not reassure that the peculiar shape would sit well in its surroundings.

The design is based on a formalistic idea that does not connect with its site and does not work as a means of providing contrast, either. The connection to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing is blocked, and the yard arrangements do not seem well thought out. When the design is dictated by the form, the interior spaces should be placed hierarchically so that the visitors climb up the spiral to the highest point, the serpent’s head, which would host the most interesting area in the museum – for instance, a nice view over Pyynikintori Square. In this case, the highest point houses mundane personnel work spaces. Arched walls are difficult to make use of when hanging art. The mood in the interior illustration is busy and does not convince the viewer of the merits of the idea.

The pavilions on Pyynikintori Square seem detached from their environment. However, the historical horseshoe-like shape of the square has been emphasised successfully. The buses do not need to reverse, which is well-conceived from the point of view of traffic flow. The bus stops are placed freely in the middle of the traffic area, however, and passengers have to cross the driving lane to reach them. The lack of platforms does not improve the user experience.

The proposal includes very little infill development, and it is allocated cautiously.
58 ROOTS INTO THE FUTURE

The proposal is carefully studied and clearly presented. The exterior architecture of the art museum is slightly restless. The busy profile of the pitched roof steals some of the effect of the statuesque wood facade; the design should have picked just one of the motifs, as the massing of the building is also rich.

The multiform art museum stretches its limbs into several directions and even latches onto the old granary building, while maintaining the connection to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing. Amurinpuisto Park, which remains behind the building, is left in the shadows and unutilised. The glass surfaces of the ground floor open up the museum’s activities to the surrounding area, even the workshop facilities, which is a fun idea.

The exhibition facilities are functional but divided into several smallish parts, which diminishes the modifiability. The shapes of the ceiling on the top floor add interest to the space, but the proposed ceiling solution drains some of the impact of the statuesque space and makes the mood somewhat restless and mundane.

The ramps leading to the underground parking facility below Pyynikintori Square cut the square in a regrettable manner. The ideas of the pavilions are eloquent, but the structures would work better on the edges of the square.

The U-shaped blocks of the residential buildings seem cramped, and even though the yards face south, they are shadowed. The day care centre’s playground has not been taken into account.

61 PLEIN AIR

The art museum has not quite found its place on the plot. The plan includes no examination of the pedestrian and bicycle connections and outdoor spaces. Instead of an abstract lawn area, a square would have been a better fit in front of the art museum. The proposed traffic arrangements, such as directing traffic from Puutarhakatu Street onto Pirkankatu Street, are erroneous. The Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing can only be accessed via an arcade, which is not feasible. The arcade is perceived as a part of the art museum, whereas pedestrian and bicycle routes must be located in uncovered outdoor spaces. If design motifs as radical as this are to be proposed, the designer should consider what is actually visible at the end of the tunnel: the end of a precast concrete building is not exactly an uplifting backdrop for the arcade.

The art museum’s exterior architecture appears outlandish and foreign to its site – the arches and dome seem to allude to oriental architecture. On the other hand, this clumsiness is also fascinating in its own way. The building opens up to its environment through glass walls. Even though dimensions are, for some reason, presented for all the drawings, the structural thicknesses are seriously off. In addition, the building services routings that take up a lot of space in an art museum have been left unaddressed. The interior views are the best feature of the proposal. They portray a good atmosphere, better than the confusing layout plans. The second floor would work better if it formed a circular tour. It seems as if the design has not quite been able to make the most of the concept.

The arrangements proposed for Pyynikintori Square are not reasonable; for example, a park has been placed on the noisiest spot by Pirkankatu Street. The ramps to the underground parking facility are under-dimensional and take up unnecessary space on the square. Infill development is presented in quite cursory terms.

62 Plassissa

The art museum has been squeezed into a small bottom surface area and withdraws to the very northern edge of the plot, but, thanks to its height, the building does not remain unnoticed. Due to the positioning, the ground floor does not really activate the surrounding urban space.

The design of the museum square is clumsy, and the protruding part of the building is distracting. The church references of the facade are far-fetched, even though the overlapping tile could, as such, be a workable material choice.
Any concept in which the facilities are spread out over various levels in a tower makes for a cumbersome museum tour for the visitor, though the stairways do open up interesting views over the high exhibition spaces. On the top level, the possibilities for top lighting have been utilised. The exhibition facilities have turned out quite disjointed, and they cannot be modified. The emergency exit also requires a separate compartmented route, which would eat up the already scant useful area on the floors even further. In the foyer view, the strong sense of the material begins to feel overpowering, as the exterior face is also loaded with themes. The architecture would benefit from some toning down in order to better highlight the art.

The solutions for Pyynikintori Square are quite standard. The bus traffic would not work in the proposed manner. The frame depths of the seemingly cramped residential construction are not realistic. The proposed closed block is shady, and the yards of the residential buildings do not work.

65 AVANT-GARDEN

The art museum buildings form a wall that leaves the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing behind it and completely shuts it out from the open public space. The image of the exterior spaces is stony and depressing. The existing valuable trees have been ignored.

The entrance to the basement level is not tempting. Placing the foyer facilities underground does not activate the environment. The above-grade building masses clad with concrete lamellae make the art museum seem more like old industrial architecture. The mood in the exterior perspective image is somewhat bleak. With the style chosen here, the designer should, for future reference, pay more attention to the presentation graphics. The starker the architectural approach, the more delicate the drawings that it should be presented with, provided that the desired effect is to convince the viewer of the beauty of the ugly.

The interior view of the entrance foyer is busy, with the beams and columns sticking out here and there. The advantage of a thick building mass is the easy modifiability within the deep frame.

The strong diagonal makes the conservatory as a part of the Pyynikintori Square composition, but a more delicate design utilising the square’s history would have been preferable. The bus traffic does not work, and the vehicles need to reverse into the street. The ramp to the underground parking facility is under-dimensioned and in the wrong spot.

In the site plan, the folded masses of the residential buildings appear dubious; in the perspective images, the disorganisation is not as disturbing. Some of the proposed development is surprisingly low from the perspective of the targeted gross floor area.

84 SFUMATO

The shape of the art museum is clean and calm. On the other hand, the design of the exterior spaces is a bit too expressive. The exterior illustration does not do justice to the museum design.

The clearly articulated entrance is easy to find. The square between the two museum buildings has been left aside and not addressed.

The placement of the extension on the plot is reasonably functional. The building spreads slightly too far eastwards, bearing down on the old granary building.

The interior spaces are quite mundane, and the staircase, for instance, has not been developed to its full potential. The museum tour arranged around an atrium is clear. The facilities for changing exhibitions are divided over two floors: below ground and on the second floor. The spaces are awkwardly shaped in places, and there is a lot of wasted space. For example, the multipurpose room does not work as an oblong strip. The mood in the interior perspective illustration is clinical, and the busy timber laths come across as a pasted-on motif.
The plan for Pyynikintori Square is quite standard. The bus traffic could have been resolved more efficiently. The new motor vehicle connection through the square is a planning error. The infill development is underwhelming: the dimensionless building masses are too high, and the U-shaped block is cramped.

86 Cultural infrastructure

The compact shape of the art museum distinctly resembles an old industrial or office building, which is presumably what the designer has intended. Apparently, the idea has been to design a rough art warehouse. It is not justifiable to have an art museum mimic the shape of an old warehouse. However, the connection to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing works well.

The nearly rectangular shape of the art museum is distracting and makes the museum appear detached from its surroundings, even though the placement of the building is natural.

The best aspect of the proposal is the illustration view of the exhibition hall. The museum tour is clear, and the spaces are modifiable. The connection to the old granary building is through a narrow corridor. The material choices are rough, with the cobblestone and wood surfaces being reminiscent of exterior spaces. The maintenance arrangements are under-dimensional: it is not enough that a vehicle can fit into the loading space, but there has to be enough room behind the truck to unload the works of art and transport them to the lift.

The arrangements on Pyynikintori Square are confusing, and the bus traffic should have been located by Pirkankatu Street. The historical character has not been utilised.

92 VIIVAT

The art museum is naturally situated, and the diagonal shape of the building mass directs traffic towards the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing as well.

The ground-level arrangements are presented quite summarily.

The floor plans are schematic, and the placement of the functions is half-hearted: the multipurpose room, for example, is located at the far end of the exhibition hall and far away from the foyer. The exhibition facilities are spread over several levels. Exhibition facilities should also have been located in the old granary building. The basement’s exhibition space behind two separate doors remains a mystery – how are people to find their way to it through all the maintenance facilities? The mood in the interior perspective image is akin to a mundane office building lobby. No art is presented in the exhibition space illustration. The proposal gives the impression that the building is not meant for exhibiting art, but rather that the art museum itself is a sculpture.

The arrangements for Pyynikintori Square are exaggerated. The buses are placed on the correct spot, but the traffic would work better with them facing Pirkankatu Street. The addition of secondary ramps to the underground parking facility on the square is unnecessary.

The infill development is presented in quite general terms, but, based on the perspective image, it appears significantly too high.

109 KOLMIO

The distinctly geometric, triangular layout of the art museum is not supported by its surroundings: in the selected direction, the shape does not address any specific need to add connections through the plot. By turning the building 90 degrees, the connection to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing could easily have been emphasised. The placement is relatively functional, but the passageways are under-dimensional.
The art museum’s appearance is fragmented, and the building seems significantly larger than its actual size. More than half of the exterior motifs could have been left out to allow the shape to appear more effortless. The red brick underscores the heavy mood.

The floor plan is confusing, and the exhibition facilities are divided between several different floors and are poorly modifiable. There could be more uninterrupted wall surfaces. The mood in the almost immaterial white interiors is as if inside a suprematist architecton, when the main role should have been reserved for the art.

The plan for Pyynikintori Square is confusing and difficult to interpret. The passenger car connections cannot be removed completely. The forest-like park is located at the wrong end of the square. The bus terminal is not workable, and the traffic to it severs the square badly. The infill development is vague, and the sketch-like presentation does not display what is happening with the ground level of the building on Pirkankatu Street, for example, as the building spreads out and eats up all the yard space.

122 FLOCK

The idea of a wood-built art museum is interesting, but the ordinary painted wood panelling does not highlight the building’s role as a public building, but rather alludes to the historical residential housing blocks. The building gives off an impression of heaviness as a result of the thick eaves, for instance. With a little tweaking of the dimensions, material and detailing of the buildings, the proposal could easily have been improved.

The whole appears cramped, and the above-grade building masses butt against each other in a chaotic manner.

The art museum facilities are located below ground. The office spaces have no windows, and they offer no other redeeming spatial features to compensate for this shortcoming. The old granary building has been treated with a heavy hand, with no regard to its protected status. The exhibition spaces have an air of mere space reservations, but, in all their vagueness, they are easily modifiable. The lighting ideas for the spaces are functional and well-studied. The atmosphere in the interior space is dull, which is only emphasised by the mundane perforated plasterboard ceiling.

The ideas for Pyynikintori Square are detached and do not make use of the elements provided by its history. The ramp to the parking facility is placed in the wrong location on Heinätori Square. The bus traffic should be moved from the western side of the square to the northern part, and having the buses reverse onto the pedestrian and bicycle route is a planning error. The hollow next to the bus terminal is a strange idea and makes the engineering of the deck covering the parking facility more difficult, as the deck has to be pushed deeper into the ground.

The historical hay-weighing building has been removed, which is a planning error. Infill development could easily have been allocated to the Puutarhakatu plot as well. In the infill on Pirkankatu Street, the buildings on the southern end of the complex are too close to the building mass by the street.

126 TEAM625429

The art museum concept is an often-seen, bog-standard museum concept. The museum building has not found the right direction on its plot and pushes out too far towards Sotkankatu Street. The coordinates of the internal courtyard are only slightly out of line with the outer shell of the building, which looks awkward. The yard arrangements have been addressed only from the point of view of the presentation graphics, with no reference to the necessary connections and passages. The maintenance connection with a vehicle lift is not feasible. The ceramic façade is interesting, albeit foreign to the site.

The merit of the proposal is in its casual touch. The wooden roof structure is interesting. The designer has a good aesthetic eye, and, at first glance, the layout appears well thought out with the spaces packed into clear zones. However, the spaces have a lot of weaknesses. The split-level exhibition spaces are not accessible to all and are therefore not feasible as presented.
The plan for Pyynikintori Square is sketch-like, and the historical character of the trees has not been recognized and the landscape space is lost.

A bus terminal has also been integrated into the heavy building mass in the Heinätori area, which is not feasible from the point of view of traffic flow. The L-shaped residential buildings on top have a suburban feel.

**129 YHDISTEET**

Attention has not been paid to the organisation of the art museum’s outdoor spaces. The access to the awkward mirrored-glass entrance pavilion is via a lawn field. This solution – i.e. burying the entire art museum underground – has not yielded any benefit. The direction of Amuri is emphasised strongly, even too obviously.

The interior plans are reduced to mere schemes, and the differences in level remain unresolved. The mood in the interior view is clinical. Maintenance issues have not been considered; for example, how does a truck turn in the street in order to deliver the art pieces to the lift? The emergency exit route does not work. The connections and exhibition spaces are corridor-like.

The heavy, northwards descending deck on Pyynikintori Square is dreary. The placement of the trees does not support the square’s historical character.

The bus terminal in the Heinätori area is not feasible, and the bus traffic turning to it would halt the traffic on Pirkankatu Street completely. The point block at the end of Puutarhakatu Street is left on its own and does not add anything positive to the cityscape.

**131 KALEIDOSKOPE**

The 45-degree angle has no point of reference within the lines of the environment and makes the art museum’s architecture stiff. The theme has been carried through slavishly, even down to the design of the desks. In the exterior illustration, fortunately, the stiff design of the art museum is not as disturbing. As a material, wood is interesting, but in the images it mainly looks like terracotta.

The art museum forms a wall towards the north, and access to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing is provided only through a gateway under a narrow passageway. The exhibition facilities are strongly divided between the basement and second floor. No conclusions can be drawn regarding the spatial character or lighting of the exhibition facilities based on the presented material, but they are divided into small units, which compromises their modifiability. The angle would probably make the spaces feel awkward.

The formalistic plan for Pyynikintori Square does not avail itself of the area’s fine history. The ramp to the parking facility is regrettably placed in the middle of the square. The vegetation does nothing to form a landscape space.

The infill development is rigid and mainly based on the oversized complex along Pirkankatu Street. The implementation of the hybrid would be difficult. The massing of the overly high colossal block is, in itself, interesting.

**133 WOODY**

The art museum complex is rambling and does not fit easily on its plot with the diagonal open-air passageway cutting through it. The artificial solution does not seem to bring any added value.
The Swiss-cheese idea of the art museum remains disconnected. This staged approach would be better suited as a temporary convention structure that seeks maximum impact. From the side, the facade looks more like an industrial building. The above-ground connection to the old granary building is awkward.

In the interior view, the walls are calmed down by boarding them up to close off the slatted exterior, and the wooden slats are only seen in the ceiling to provide top lighting. An escalator in such a small museum is a drab solution.

The Pyynikintori Square arrangements are confusing and do not relate to their location or the area's history. Placing the buses in a queue unnecessarily takes up too much space. The infill development pays no regard to its environment and is too high.

137 LÄHDE

The art museum sits relatively easily in its spot, but would benefit from slight down-scaling. The clustered massing of the art museum is flexible. The ideas for the facade rouse interest, even if the mood in the exterior perspective view is somewhat generic and could also be from a commercial building, for example.

The exhibition facilities are clear and modifiable. Top lighting has been utilised. The mood in the view of the lobby is promising, and the multiform wood staircase adds a piquant touch to the otherwise clean-lined and calm architecture.

The proposal has put commendable effort in planning the Pyynikintori Square – perhaps even too much effort, and trimming down some of the themes would have produced a better end result. The historical themes have been taken into account, but the square could have been divided into zones instead of the same organic expression spilling through and beyond the square.

The infill development has not been proposed in the best possible manner. The yard spaces required for housing have been forgotten. The building mass along Pirkankatu Street is unclear and does not align itself with the street, which leaves it disconnected from its environment. The art hotel as a part of the museum is an interesting, but difficult idea in terms of the possible phased implementation.

138 8700

The U-shaped art museum facing the old granary building seems natural. Unfortunately, the opportunities offered by the shape have not been utilised. Instead, there is a theatre in the courtyard, which was not included in the room programme. Confusingly, the courtyard is sometimes presented as an open space, such as in the site plan, and sometimes as a built space, such as in the floor plan. The space would have worked better as a courtyard. As an exterior material, stone blocks are a foreign motif in this location.

The art museum is large and can only just fit onto its plot. There is no public outdoor space left around the museum.

The layout plans have been presented on a schematic level only. The placement of the facilities is awkward; the multipurpose room is situated at the far end in the maintenance space zone. The slight slant in the lines seems cumbersome, and no justification for it can be found. The flow of the museum tour is clear, but the theatre blocks the connection to the old part. The mood in the perspective images is not convincing.

The plan for Pyynikintori Square is confusing, and the dimensions are off the mark. For example, a bus terminal requires more height.

The placement of residential infills is natural, but the developments are presented in very cursory terms, and the site plan does not mention the number of floors. In the aerial view, infill development is not presented at all. The dimensions of the high building mass on top of the art museum are completely unrealistic.
**140 Colibri**

The starting point for the planning of the art museum has been to create an expressive design. The multiform body remains very foreign to its environment. The city structure analyses are superficial, and more could be gained from this type of approach by defining the lines of force based on points of reference within the immediate surroundings.

The author should make more effort to relate to the existing situation. For example, it would have been wise to make an inventory of the trees and try to preserve them.

The building has been reduced to a sketch of a statuesque form, into which the necessary facilities have been crammed after the fact. The layout is schematic. The floor plan for the ground level (+0) does not include a presentation of the surrounding area, and the linkage with the environment at the ground level can therefore not be evaluated. The floor plans are awkwardly divided between different presentation boards, which makes it difficult to study them. If a design approach as demanding as this is chosen, the plans should be carefully thought out, and the graphics should demonstrate how all the self-inflicted challenges have been solved.

The plans for Pyynikintori Square have remained mere outlines. The ramps on the sides of the square are an unfortunate choice.

The residential development is scattered, and the plan does not present the number of floors. Based on the sketch-like material, it appears that the targeted gross floor area is not achieved.

**141 ZDESIGN**

The disposition of the art museum is correctly directed, but the building spreads quite widely. The lowness of the building and the way in which the roof is opened make for a relaxed whole. The differences in level in the outdoor spaces seem cumbersome, and assessing them in the absence of survey height markings is difficult. Preserving the existing trees is a nice idea, but difficult to implement in the middle of a new building, because the entire plot will be excavated during the construction phase.

The layout plans have remained on a schematic level. With such a wild design approach, the graphic material should be enough to demonstrate that the designer can handle the complicated geometry. The exhibition facilities are on the ground level, making the transportation of large art pieces effortless. The maintenance traffic does not work, as the vehicles cannot reverse out into the street.

The canopy on Pyynikintori Square is far too large, and the second ramp on the square is superfluous. The infill development is heavy and focusses too much on office construction.

**142 AGORA**

The art museum sits easily in its plot and assumes the coordinates of the Pyynikki area’s block structure for the internal courtyard, which links the museum to its environment. Studying the urban space with a scale model is to be advocated, but the design has not managed to make the most of the model and the translucent museum building does nothing for the analysis of the building in relation to its environs.

The appearance is characterised by megографics, which, as a theme, is dated and somewhat too conspicuous despite its playfulness. The mood in the exterior view is beautiful, but the idea of an art museum as a monumental building is old-fashioned. The interior could be more open towards the outdoor space, making the building more approachable. The designer has presumably wanted to emphasise the closed nature of the exterior face so as not to detract from the effect of the open internal courtyard.

The flow of the museum tour is clear, though the blind alley layout is a bit dull. The top lighting from the top of the wall does not work. The point-like skylights would gain more effect if the rest of the architecture was calmer. The main stairway is quite plain. The placement of the museum shop separately to rely on outdoor access only
is a mistake. The connection to the old granary building is offered only through the media room, which is not practical. The interior views have a serene and promising feel.

The new vehicle access to Pyynikintori Square is questionable. The bus traffic should be arranged in a more compact manner.

The infill development seems awkward. The shape of the slanted building mass on Pirkankatu Street is uncontrolled, and no yard space has been allocated for housing. The roof-top yards between the branches of the building would be too small as residential yards.

147 Tähkä (2)

The positioning of the art museum blocks the long view axis of Puutarhakatu Street in a way that does not appear intended. The Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing and the old granary building are left behind the new building.

The ground-level floor mainly includes maintenance and office facilities, which does nothing to activate the surrounding urban space. The idea of separate closed building masses that are only connected to each other via glass corridors does not work in practice; during the daytime, the glass surfaces appear as black, reflective masses and the end result is wall-like and closed-off. Brick is a natural facade material, but the ideas for its use are unoriginal and slightly overdesigned.

The exhibition spaces are placed in a tube-like fashion one after the other. The mood in the perspective images is commercial, even though the material choices are rough. Ceiling light point solutions have not been presented realistically.

The plans for Pyynikintori Square are quite standard. The historical arch motif has been eliminated.

The proposed infill development is unrealistic. The bar-code-like construction is far too dense, robbing the apartments of light and privacy.

2.2.6 LOWER CATEGORY

English translations of the evaluations have been made by proposal, only for the proposals submitted in English.

7 A13581

The art museum’s architecture is in no way connected to its environment. The outdoor spaces have not really been addressed, and they are only presented in very rough terms. The material choices are foreign to the site. Preserving the old tree in front of the old part is not possible in the middle of a new construction.

The author has not fully grasped the objectives of the competition: the new building brutally covers the old part, which has not been addressed in the proposal at all and is assigned no functions. Likewise, the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing is completely overlooked. The division of the exhibition facilities between several floors with small respective surface areas is not a practical solution. The maintenance and visitor traffic intersect in an unfortunate manner. The atmosphere is akin to an office complex – nothing clearly states that the building is an art museum.

The bus traffic arrangements for Pyynikintori Square are not workable. The design of the square area is clumsy, and the square space is lost under the crushing presence of the new buildings.

The overly high development is located on Pyynikintori only, which is a grave mistake and completely destroys the character of the square.

18 Castor and Pollux

The concept of the proposal is too ambitious for this delicate site. For example, an underground connection across Pirkankatu Street would not, in reality, be pleasant due to its darkness.

The ample perspective images are illustrative. The proposed construction on top of the former janitor’s house and existing art museum does not impress. The grand gesture gives rise to a lot of technical challenges, but does not yield corresponding benefits. Placing the entrance at basement level seems cumbersome in a high tower, as the entrance is not easily accessible from the street level.

The exhibition facilities are divided over several separate buildings and many levels, making the museum tour reliant on lift connections.

The solutions for Pyynikintori Square have been implemented on the terms dictated by the formalistic elliptical design. Underground shops beneath the deck are unrealistic. The proposed thick frame depths do not facilitate the implementation of high-quality housing.

The proposal has been carefully studied all the way down to the structural sections, but an all-glass art museum is not a sensible solution in the Finnish climate. Natural ventilation in the carefully regulated museum conditions would be an immense challenge.

39 KOPPELO

The art museum is presented with a design-first approach, and the interior spaces have been forcefully crammed into the expressive architecture, which has led to some seemingly awkward solutions. The building mass is fragmented, leading to long passageways. The too rich material palette further emphasises the convoluted impression. The perspective images are very cursory and do not provide any additional information.

A confusing proposal that attempts to justify the overwrought design with the nearby library building. However, the positioning of the new extension is natural.
The spaces offer little possibilities for modifiability. The connection to the old granary building is proposed to occur both from the basement and via a second-floor level bridge. The bridge partially blocks the view towards the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing, an element that has not been considered in the proposal at all.

The plan for Pyynikintori Square is presented as a quite general outline, with the exception of the over-designed canopy that does not bring any added value but rather dominates the classic landscape space. The bus traffic is cumbersome, and it would have been advisable to place the platforms diagonally.

The infill development has been resolved with two towers, whose downwards tapering design is structurally difficult to implement. The towers do not meet the gross floor area demands, and the point-like development does nothing to unify the urban space.

52 HEI HAY

The evaluation of the proposal is made difficult by the very confusing presentation technique. Placing the art museum completely underground is not justifiable. If, however, such a design choice is proposed, the solution should bring added value to the ground level as well. Glass pyramids are suited to a delicate historical environment, but not in this case. The massive new building along Pirkankatu Street completely blocks the view to the museum, which is a planning error.

An attempt has apparently been made to link the museum block with Pyynikintori Square by a diagonal axis, but the gesture is not enough to compensate for the museum being left behind a large new construction. The arrangements for both maintenance and visitor traffic are under-dimensioned and unworkable. The museum is accessed through a narrow corridor and an understated staircase.

Even the personnel work spaces are placed underground, which cannot be deemed acceptable despite the ceiling light points. The glass ceilings allow direct sunlight into the exhibition space, which does not work. The media room should be separated from the exhibition spaces by more than just drapes.

The arrangements for Pyynikintori Square are disorganised and confusing. The dimensions of the ramps are unrealistic, and the location is unadvisable.

Most of the plots designated for infill development have been left unutilised, and all of the gross floor area has been crammed into a single, disproportionate building that is in conflict with its environment. Opportunities for harmonising the urban space with the aid of infill development have been left unutilised.

104 BINB

The art museum architecture is heavy and clumsy. The proposal does not provide an explanation for the relationship of the simple geometry to the location. The single-storey building mass is reminiscent of a warehouse, and raising the office spaces as an emphasised crown on top of the art museum is hierarchically illogical.

The maintenance traffic intersects with the access to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing. The yard spaces are presented in very rough terms.

In the site plan, the mass seems relatively compact, and the positioning is also approximately on target.

There are as many as four entrances, which is not good from the point of view of the museum’s functions. The mood in the interior illustration is mundane and dull. The museum tour flows clearly, with the new exhibition spaces placed schematically all on the same level and circling the central zone.

The plan for Pyynikintori Square has been left as is, with the exception of bus traffic, which has not been addressed in a workable fashion: a comb-like organisation would work better. The proposed infill development is fumbling. Simpler masses and aligning the buildings directly with Pirkankatu Street would serve better to harmonise the urban structure.
116 THE TREE TOP GALLERY

The art museum building is light and collage-like. The building spreads widely on the plot and, in part, too far onto the Saarikuja Street line. The exterior architecture is too rich and contains disconnected references.

Spaces of secondary value open up towards the atrium, and the significance of the atrium remains unclear. The curved glass walls do not bring added value to the design. The exhibition spaces are too corridor-like. The space arrangements of the entrance are cramped and under-dimensioned.

The yellow terminal building on Pyynikintori Square is too large and commands more attention in the cityscape than the museum building that remains subordinate to it. The infill development on Pirkankatu Street is scattered, and the shapes of the building masses are artificial and unsuited for the site.

117 DIAMONDS AND RUST

The art museum completely disregards the surrounding building stock and could, in principle, be located anywhere. The architecture implies references to a space ship, and the mood in the confusing perspective images is as if in a dystopia. If the intention was to create a statuesque mass, the lift shaft tower flattens the attempt. The busy presentation technique makes the evaluation difficult. The ground-level layout plan includes no presentation of the museum surrounds.

The layouts do not work – for example, not much besides the staircase can fit into the entrance level. The top floor with the glass roof is, to all practical purposes, a hothouse. A second emergency exit route is missing.

The plan for Pyynikintori Square with the massive triumphal arch is completely detached from the environment and downright intimidating in its monumentality. The author has completely misunderstood the character of Tampere and the significance of the square's history. The plan also fails in terms of the square functions.

The proposed infill development is schematic, and the twenty-storey mass along Puutarhakatu Street stands in complete indifference to its surroundings.

It seems, however, that the plan is not presented as a joke, but that the author has researched the names of Finnish artists, for example, thus demonstrating at least some effort to grasp the task. The author is advised to carefully study all of the appended competition material before undertaking the next competition entry in order to fully grasp how the plans are to be presented and what aspects need to be taken into account in designing a specific building (its connection with the environment, cityscape, surrounding yard spaces, the building’s functions, etc.). As it is, the proposal completely disregards the surrounding context, which has led to a sub-standard end result.

119 YARDBIRDS

The selected art museum concept, which is based on subterranean facilities and varied sculptural bodies above ground, is flexible, but the pieces have not found their place within the urban space and therefore remain detached without forming an interesting whole. The connection to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing works well.

The architecture is plagued with formalism, and it would have been advisable to have picked more local themes. The above-ground pieces could have been aligned with reference points in the surrounding areas, which would have calmed down the whole.

The interiors remain schematic, and there are awkward differences in level between the spaces. The emergency exit route does not work. The mood in the interior illustration does not impress as an art museum.
The avenue on Pyynikintori Square is justified from the point of view of providing necessary connections, but the design disrupts the classical composition that it based on symmetry. The infill development is based on point blocks and is quite suburban, confusing, and too high.

124 ILMATAR

The art museum has not found its place on the plot and has no ties to its environment. The displacement of the building is underscored by the treatment and material of the facade. The outdoor spaces have remained sketchy.

The concept is built around an overly impressive staircase and atrium lobby, and it is inefficient in its utilisation of space. The exhibition facilities are awkwardly divided between the basement and the 3rd and 4th floors. The exhibition space lighting is not explained. Exhibitions on the top floor could have utilised ceiling light points. A café on the top level does not activate its surroundings. The dimensioning is poorly handled; the maintenance lift, for example, is under-dimensional. A second emergency exit is missing. The mood in the interior illustration is reminiscent of an office building.

The historical character of Pyynikintori Square is not taken into account, and a massive building in the shape of an air glider is placed in the middle of the square, dominating the surrounding area. The treatment of the square is in disregard for its environment and only works in regard to the bus traffic.

The frame depth of the three-storey base in the infill development is unfeasible, and the towers on top are over-designed and therefore restless.

127 CON’TEXT

The new construction is relatively accurately placed, but pushes too far south, covering some of the old buildings.

The huge office chunks seem overbearing in relation to the barn-like atrium. It is difficult to find justifications for the concept, though the preservation of the old trees is a nice thought. The combining of the functions makes a phased implementation difficult. Pressure-impregnated wood as an exterior material is not ecologically sound and is therefore unjustified.

The exhibition facilities remain underground and receive no kind of natural light. Even the schematic idea is not fully executed, but the staircase interrupts the tube-like exhibition tour. The mood in the interior views resembles an office building.

Covering Pyynikintori Square with a deck is a heavy-handed measure and destroys the historical environment. The presentation of the plans for the deck lacks credibility, and an idea as drastic as this would have been better served by placing commercial premises along Pirkankatu Street to activate the bleak edge of the deck.

Infill development is presented schematically, but the solutions seem ordinary. The plan leaves no yard space for the residential buildings on Pirkankatu.

132 NEXUS 3

The massing of the art museum buildings is confusing and has no connection to its location. The ravine-like composition of two masses faces inwards, and the view from the old granary building is that of a brutal concrete wall. The ravine inside the building remains very narrow and corridor-like, and the interior illustration made from a worm’s-eye view perspective does nothing to convince the viewer of the mood.

The exterior materials are confusing, and the exterior perspective views give off something of a rubbery impression.
The layout is scattered, and the exhibition spaces are divided over several floors. The exhibition space concept based on separate rooms is not modifiable. The connection to the old granary building is provided by an exceptionally narrow passage. The emergency exit and maintenance routes do not work.

On Pyynikintori Square, the buses are spread out too widely, and the issue could be resolved in a more compact manner. The buildings at the southern end of the square are a planning error, which dilutes the square's historical value despite the semi-circular shape. In addition, the services are far away from the public streams of Pirkankatu Street.

The dimensioning of the infill development is not handled properly when it comes to frame depths, among other aspects. The yards are shady.

136 REVERSE

The art museum is positioned naturally, but the vague shape renders it unable to define the urban space.

Entry to the museum is by way of a stairway down to the basement, which offers a slightly dreary impression in the exterior illustration. However, the exhibition facilities are brought to the upper level, which yields impractical connections. The wedding-cake-like massing appears awkward and would also be structurally difficult to implement. The materials are foreign to the area.

The allocation of the facilities is very confusing, and the layout is schematic. The toilet facilities are accessed through the settling room, which means the author has not understood what the rooms are used for. Only an outdoor access is proposed for the old part, which is a design error. The maintenance traffic does not work: deliveries are loaded into the lift directly from the outside. The exhibition facilities have all-glass walls, which begs the question, where is the art meant to be hung?

The plans for Pyynikintori Square are standard, but well-functioning. The placement of the infill development is fumbling: the building mass on Puutarhakatu Street has ended up in the middle of the plot and does not align itself naturally with the street. The round tower on Pirkankatu Street is alien to its environment and too high.

139 FI1612

The appearance of the new art museum includes references to the old granary building, and the building height is reconciled with the historical building. However, the end result is an almost comical massing of floors, in which all of the parts have their own style. Relinquishing the symmetry would make the mass less monumental.

The idea to lift the museum entrance up onto a pedestal is an ill-conceived one: the museum should be easily accessible, and placing it up on a pedestal gives an entirely wrong reference. The direction of the building is taken from the old granary, which, as an idea, seems justified, but when examined based on the images, the solution does not appear to work. The traffic arrangements are crude, such as the drop-off traffic entry and exit points along Pirkankatu Street in front of the museum.

The layout is schematic, and the building does not work. The entrance level mainly functions as an entryway. It is cumbersome to first have to climb up the monumental steps to reach the entrance, only to descend another set of stairs down to the basement. The exhibition facilities are located underground. The mood in the view of the lobby resembles that of a commercial building. The illustrations are technically skilfully executed, but the impression they give is too rubbery.

The plan for Pyynikintori Square draws ideas from the historical semi-circular shape, but turning the arch at the southern end of the square to face the opposite direction is not impressive, even if an attempt has thus been made to create a connection towards the secondary school building.

The infill development plans are faulty. Residential buildings cannot be built so close together that they almost touch each other; enough space needs to be provided between them to meet fire safety regulations as well as natural light and privacy requirements. A yard is also required.
143 INCANDESCENT

The art museum’s exterior architecture is attention-seeking and completely alien to its environment. The trunks sticking into the building masses are a forced motif, and, with the lighting, the impression given is that of an amusement park.

The new building arrogantly dominates its environment and carelessly blocks the connections to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing.

The interior spaces are tubular, and the curved walls are unfeasible from the point of view of hanging art. The exhibition facilities are divided over two floors despite the vast building mass. The mood in the interior views is as if from a scary science-fiction film. The maintenance traffic ring route is a disproportionate solution for a small art museum. The emergency exit route does not work.

The Pyynikintori Square terminal has two separate traffic areas, which eats up space for other functions. The square’s southern part intensely closes in around itself.

The proposed infill development remains very roughly presented and protrudes on Pirkankatu Street to block out the hay-weighing building. The yards have been dedicated as parking areas

144 JUST DRAW IT

The design of the art museum is clumsy, and the material choices do not seem justified. The conspicuous building is independent and unconcerned with its environment, turning its back on the old granary building.

The new extension takes its bearings from Pyynikintori Square and opens strongly towards the square. The whole of Pirkankatu Street has been directed underground in order to connect the museum plot seamlessly to Pyynikintori with a lawn-covered deck. The solution is not feasible and would lead to dreary long ramps that would be like scars on the cityscape. The building completely disregards its environment and blocks the view and connections to the Amuri Museum of Workers’ Housing. In the aerial view, the size of the mass is grossly deceiving, and the dominating effect of this megalomaniac proposal is not fully exposed.

The tower-like solution is not functional in museum use, as the spaces are very separated and divided into different floors, delivering very little modifiability. The building is distinctly divided into two parts. The exhibition facilities in the southern part all face south with a large glass wall, turning them into hothouses and poor exhibition spaces. The functions of the maintenance unit in the back are somewhat left to speculation. The need for toilet and other service facilities is not as great as presented. Ventilation utility rooms are presented separately for each floor only in the dropped ceiling space, which is not feasible.

Pyynikintori Square has been turned into an immense lawn with no regard for the square's historical character. The six entrance buildings to the parking level are exaggerated. The current street-lining trees have been replaced with a double line of trees.

No infill development is presented at all.

145 SAA17

The art museum has not found its place and also seems to still be looking for the right coordinates.

The building looks like it has sunken down by a floor. The busy and uncontrolled architecture is slightly calmed down by the white modernist style of the facades, but the selected aesthetics are in conflict with the rest of the design. The mood in the perspective images is rubbery.

The functions are presented as a schematic overview, and the layout contains functional and dimensional errors. For example, the office can only be accessed through the exhibition space. There are two lobbies. The shop is only served by an outdoor access. The exhibition spaces circle an internal courtyard with glass walls,
which is problematic from the point of view of both lighting and hanging the art. The extra connection to the old granary building from the second floor is an eyesore in the cityscape, and it is also functionally unnecessary.

The arrangements for Pyynikintori Square are completely exaggerated. The bridge connection adds no value. The underside of the bridge is a dark and dreary space. The shapes of the infill development are awkward, and the buildings are considerably too high.
2.3 The result of the competition

2.3.1 The competition outcome

In their assessment, the competition jury concluded that the competition proposal submitted under the pseudonym "Siilo" best fulfils the criteria specified in the competition programme. In deviation from the competition programme, the jury unanimously decided to award the prizes, purchases and honorary mentions as follows:

1st prize, €70 000, to proposal no. 88, Siilo

Shared 3rd prize, €30 000, to proposal no. 41, TAD Tampere Art District

Shared 3rd prize, €30 000, to proposal no. 74, dogma

Purchase, €15 000, to proposal no. 14, Amurin kattojen yllä

Purchase, €15 000, to proposal no. 113, LOOTA

Purchase, €15 000, to proposal no. 68, MUSEUM SQUARE

Honorary mention to proposal no. 21, THE MIND PALACE

Honorary mention to proposal no. 82, Nexus

2.3.2 The jury’s recommendations

On the basis of the competition result, the jury proposes the following future measures:

Museum building

The competition jury recommends to the Tampere City Board that the commission to design both the museum and the block of flats situated on the museum plot be given to the author / authors of the winning proposal. Using the same designer in both projects is the best way to ensure the functionality of the plot’s maintenance arrangements, etc. As the buildings are located very close to each other, the design must also ensure the architectural balance between the residential building and the public art museum.

In the event the implementation is given to a foreign company, it must name a cooperation partner, i.e. a person who has the qualifications of a Finnish principal designer.

Planning for Pyyunikintori Square and its surroundings

The solutions presented in the best competition proposals may be used as the basis for future development. The City of Tampere may order further planning work from the authors of the prize-winning proposals.

The other infill development planning in the competition area that has been proposed by competitors will be used as a basis for local detailed planning. Construction will be implemented as separate projects by means of plot assignment competitions.

Prior to any further planning work, the competitor or group must demonstrate to the contracting authority that they meet the requirements concerning the economy and financing, technical performance and professional qualifications, in addition to being able to fulfil all statutory obligations.
2.3.3 Signing of the evaluation minutes

The jury approved these evaluation minutes in Tampere on 09 August 2017

Pekka Salmi

Anna-Kaisa Heinämäki

Ranja Hautamäki

Sakari Leinonen

Taina Myllyharju

Hanna Helander

Annikki Järvinen

Taru Hurme

Outi Leppänen

Lauri Savisaari

Ville Hara
2.3.4 Opening of the sealed envelopes containing the names of the competitors

After signing the evaluation minutes, the jury opened the sealed envelopes containing the names of the competitors who were awarded prizes, purchases and honorary mentions. The following authors were revealed as the authors of the said proposals:

**1st prize**, proposal no. 88, pseudonym “Siilo”

Copyright:

Aarti Ollila Ristola Arkkitehdit Oy
Helsinki, Finland

Authors:

Team:
Erkko Aarti, Architect SAFA
Aarto Ollila, Architect SAFA
Mikki Ristola, Architect
Kuutti Halinen, Architect SAFA
Pyry Kantonen, Architect
Meri Wiikinkoski, B.Sc.

Scale model:
Aarti Ollila Ristola Arkkitehdit Oy

**Shared 3rd prize**, proposal no. 41, pseudonym “TAD Tampere Art District”

Copyright:

Lundén Architecture Company
Helsinki, Finland

Authors:

Eero Lundén, Architect SAFA
Maija Parviainen, Architect SAFA
Ron Aasholm, Architect
Carmen Lee, Architect

Assistants:
Emma Koivuranta, Architect
Xudong Yan, Architect
Tuuli Loukola, student of architecture

Traffic expert:
Jouni Lehtomaa

Scale model:
Klaus Stolt

**Shared 3rd prize**, proposal no. 74, pseudonym “dogma”

Authors and copyright:
Matias Kotilainen
Tuomas Martinsaari
Paul Thynell
Helsinki / Espoo, Finland

Scale model:
Pienoismallipaja Nina Pohjanheimo

**Purchase**, proposal no. 14, pseudonym “Amurin kattojen yllä”

Copyright:
Huttunen-Lipasti-Pakkanen Arkkitehdit Oy,
Risto Huttunen, Santeri Lipasti, Pekka Pakkanen
Helsinki, Finland

Authors:
Risto Huttunen, Architect SAFA
Santeri Lipasti, Architect SAFA
Pekka Pakkanen, Architect SAFA
Uula Kohonen, Architect SAFA

Assistants:
Aku Jokinen, student of architecture
Tomas Hartman, student of architecture
Irene Hämäläinen, student of architecture
Seppo Tusa, Architect SAFA
Essi Wallenius, Architect SAFA
Julia Falck, student of architecture

Landscape planning:
Emilia Weckman, Landscape Architect, MARK, WE3 Oy

Scale model:
Olli-Pekka Keramaa, Pienoismall Oy

**Purchase**, proposal no. 68, pseudonym “MUSEUM SQUARE”

Authors and copyright:
Sjöblom Freij Arkitekter AB:
Jacob Sjöblom
Axel Freij
Stockholm, Sweden

Scale model:
Sjöblom Freij Arkitekter AB

**Purchase**, proposal no. 113, pseudonym “LOOTA”

Authors and copyright:
Team “LÄHELTÄ YLÖS”:
Kristian Kontula, Architect SAFA
Eveliina Sarapää, Architect SAFA
Jalo Sippola, Architect SAFA
Helsinki, Finland

Assistants:
Kari Pöykkö, Architect SAFA
Olli Nurminen, art student

Scale model:
Arkkitehtipinoismalli Matti Kangaspuro
Honorary mention, proposal no. 21, pseudonym “THE MIND PALACE”

Authors and copyright:

Benjamin Schulman, student of architecture
Espoo, Finland

Scale model:

Svante Knuus, Maker3D Oy
Toni Järvitalo, 3D Formtech Oy
Arto Tuisku, Jyrsijä Helsinki
Henrietta Nyman-Lind, Henriettan kukat

Honorary mention, proposal no. 82, pseudonym “Nexus”

Copyright:

Atelier Lorentzen Langkilde ApS
Copenhagen, Denmark

Authors:

Kristian Langkilde
Kasper Lorentzen

Assistants:

Mathias Holm
Peter Stilling
Thea Berg

Scale model:

Asgar Hoegh
Vilde Livsdatter
3. IMAGES

3.1 The scale models
The competition organiser requested the 10 scale models. The site model into which the competitor’s scale model is fitted.
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Shared 3rd prize, proposal no. 41, pseudonym
”TAD Tampere Art District”
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TAD - Tampere Art District

TAD - Tampere Art District
OPEN INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION ON THE TAMPERE ART MUSEUM AREA AND PYYNIKINTORI SQUARE

TO EXPLORE THE POTENTIAL OF THE TAMPERE ART MUSEUM AREA AND THE PYYNIKINTORI SQUARE TO BECOME A CULTURAL LANDMARK OF THE CITY AND A SYMBOL OF THE CITY'S INTERNATIONALITY.

The competition is an open international design competition that aims to create a unique and innovative design concept for the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square. The competition is open to architects, designers, and multidisciplinary teams from all over the world.

The competition is divided into two phases: a preliminary phase and a final phase. In the preliminary phase, participants are required to submit a concept design for the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square. The designs will be evaluated based on creativity, originality, and feasibility.

The final phase of the competition will involve the selected teams to develop their concept designs into detailed and realistic designs. The designs will be evaluated based on their technical feasibility, cost-effectiveness, and potential for implementation.

The winning teams will be awarded a cash prize and the opportunity to see their designs implemented in the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square. The competition is open to professionals, students, and non-professionals alike.

The competition is an opportunity for designers to showcase their creativity and skills and to contribute to the development of the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square. The competition is open to everyone, regardless of their background or experience, and invites participants to share their ideas and visions for the future of the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square.

The competition is a platform for collaboration and exchange of ideas. It provides a chance for participants to learn from each other and to develop new ideas and approaches. The competition is an opportunity for designers to engage with the community and to contribute to the development of the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square.

The competition is open to everyone, regardless of their background or experience. It invites participants to share their ideas and visions for the future of the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square. The competition is an opportunity for designers to collaborate and to exchange ideas, and to develop new ideas and approaches.

The competition is a platform for learning and innovation. It provides a chance for participants to learn from each other and to develop new ideas and approaches. The competition is an opportunity for designers to contribute to the development of the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square.

The competition is an opportunity to be part of a significant project that will have a lasting impact on the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square. The competition is an opportunity to make a contribution to the development of the Tamper Art Museum area and the Pyynikintori square.
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Shared 3rd prize, proposal no. 74, pseudonym “dogma”
Näkymä Pyynikintorille kohti Tamperen arkkitehtuuria sekä päästääköntä

Kaupunkikuva
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Museorakennus

Lupionsa auteliiin tiettävät muutokset olivat olennaisia, mutta niillä ei tullut tarkoittaa lain kaasua. Sosiaali- ja terveydenhuollon sektoriin liittyvän alueen kehityksen kannalta on tärkeää, että tällaisia vaiheita suoritetaan. Myös tulevat muutokset ovat tärkeitä, mutta niissä on oltava tarkoite ja huomio kaikkia vaikuttavia tekijöitä.()


Purchase, proposal no. 14, pseudonym
"Amurin kattojen yllä"
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Purchase, proposal no. 68, pseudonym “MUSEUM SQUARE”
The design for the new extension to the Tampere Art Museum is based on our proposal that the museum should be a contemporary answer to its natural, historical, and architectural context. It is especially close to the Finnish Art Museum area, so the new museum building will be a natural addition to the surrounding area.

Museum Square

This section of the proposal shows the proposed layout of the new museum building and the surrounding area. The main entrance is located on the north side of the new building, and there is a large courtyard at the rear of the building. The area is surrounded by greenery, and there is a small park area in the center.

A new museum entrance is planned on the south side of the new building. The parking area is located to the north of the building, and there is a small plaza in front of the main entrance. The area is designed to be accessible by foot and by bicycle, with a network of pedestrian paths and bike lanes.

Developments for future use are planned in the suggested areas along the main axis and towards the south, with approximately 1000 m² in total. The area will be developed in stages, with the first phase focusing on the main building and the surrounding area. Further development is planned for future years, and the area will be developed sustainably and in harmony with the existing surroundings.

The overall character of the museum area will be emphasized, with a new museum entrance and a new parking area. The new museum entrance will be located on the north side of the building, and the parking area will be located to the south. The area will be designed to be accessible by foot and by bike, with a network of pedestrian paths and bike lanes.

In conclusion, the design for the new museum building is focused on creating a modern, sustainable, and accessible space that will enhance the cultural life of Tampere and its surrounding area.
The museum building

The new buildings capital and recycled structure originates from the existing museum. The new building is constructed with local building materials and natural materials from Finland meeting high sustainable and ecological norms. In the museum, all materials used in the construction, e.g., timber, stone, and glass, have been reused or recycled. This approach is based on the principles of preserving and enhancing the existing museum, creating a new museum, and designing a museum that is environmentally sustainable. The aim is to create a sustainable building with certification through BREEAM or LEED.

The building is constructed to be a multifunctional timber structure with a steel grid frame system, making it possible to have an open and flexible room layout for the floor and the exhibition spaces. The building envelope is made of recycled glass and wood with a wooden structure that allows the old museum’s historical façades. The glass roof beam allows the design creating a visually open interior and during the dark hours, the beams give a sense of the structure that makes the museum’s interior blend with the building’s external appearance. The south facing façade of the exhibition spaces, as well as the office break rooms and meeting area, is oriented to be placed with ideas for natural light and views towards the street side. The main exhibition area is designed with variation which reduces the surface area of the floor during heavy visits.

As a visitor, you enter the spacious foyer area from the Museum Square. The foyer has an integrated entrance with fuse boxes that can be accessed during events. A large reception desk and seating area is located in close proximity. The arrangement makes it possible for the same staff to serve both the museum and the street side. The building area is designed to be flexible and can be adapted for the museum and the Museum of Modern housing.

The existing museum exhibition and the new building is accessed from the foyer area through a large day-lighted stair into the existing basement. At this level, the museum showroom and cabins are located. The old museum layout will be preserved as an upper floor with a seminar area and a small exhibition.

The new exhibition spaces are located in three floors. All rooms are designed to be flexible and can be adapted for the museum and the Museum of Modern housing. The building structure can be controlled with four different levels, while the day lighting in the basement is dynamic. The design includes a range of sustainable approaches. The Tamper Art Museum will be a unique public building with a feeling for the city and its inhabitants but also a destination worth a visit.
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Exhibition Spaces

The open-plan structure of the exhibition space allows for a wide range of curating possibilities. Adding temporary walls to the existing space, for example, can allow for the creation of smaller, more intimate exhibition areas. Natural lighting is crucial, and artificial lighting can be controlled to fit a specific show or event. The overall floor layout can be adapted to fit the size and scale of the space, or even be reconfigured for shorter, more flexible installations or for showing multimedia. The plans below show six possible scenarios, but the possibilities are endless.

1. **Exhibition Level 01**: This level features a large open space with areas designated for different types of exhibitions. The space is well-lit with natural light, and there are large windows allowing for views of the surrounding area.

2. **Exhibition Level 02**: This level has a more varied layout, with different sections dedicated to different types of exhibitions. The space is well-equipped with lighting and audio-visual equipment.

3. **Exhibition Level 03**: This level is designed for larger exhibitions, with ample space for large installations and interactive displays. The area is well-lit, and there are dedicated areas for different types of exhibitions.

4. **Exhibition Level 04**: This level features a more intimate space, with smaller areas dedicated to different types of exhibitions. The space is well-lit, and there are dedicated areas for different types of exhibitions.

5. **Exhibition Level 05**: This level is designed for small-scale exhibitions, with dedicated areas for different types of exhibitions. The space is well-lit, and there are dedicated areas for different types of exhibitions.

6. **Exhibition Level 06**: This level features a large open space with areas designated for different types of exhibitions. The space is well-equipped with lighting and audio-visual equipment.

---
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"THE MIND PALACE"
A stone garden is a careful composition of neatly laid stones, yet artfully placed stones, sited in the picturesque setting of Pyytinra. The Tamper Art Museum is a stone garden. The slower stones, the gravel, is older than the surrounding garden. Further stone pieces provide the space for the museum of the art museum.

A fine composition of stones is an appropriate scheme for the art museum site, where the grid of buildings and the art institutions are oriented to the southwest. The main area is positioned as a landscape at the visual intersection of Pyytinra and Hanila. The former seems to lead towards the city centre, while its highest point is a turning point for Pyytinra.

The Stone Garden is a place for a meditative experience in tune with the activities of everyday life. To preserve the special atmosphere, the building should be preserved in situ. An extension might be added in the future, but these will be similar in character to the cultural functions of the art museum. The new apartment buildings are simple blocks with wedge-like stumps in place where justified by the city structure. The ground floor contains connected spaces, above these are apartments. In Pyytinra, a new apartment extends along the north side of the square where the bus station and tram stop are.

For plan, a 1:5000 and aerial image of Pyytinra from the south.
The Frame of a Painting

Pyynikintori is a monumental painting. Beautiful as it is, it only has to be properly framed. Edges are the most important part of an artwork. The north edge of Pyynikintori is the topographic hump. The two pieces are bound close to the top of the frame with the title. It links the building and the site. The painting's edges are important for its longevity. They are large-tolerant dimensions to large ceramic pieces and every detail is under the rule for ensuring their life. This hump can also draw the edges from one to another. In the south end, the historical building has been moved three meters to the north to make space for the playing ground. The boulder acts as a protective barrier between the playing ground and the square. The vertical gap through the hedge helps the tree structure. The E. M. Illiainen School has been moved two meters to provide space between the concert hall and the school building.

The center of the square is left empty, but it is used for various events and sports activities. The open space ends the cityscape to the historical building and allows the full appreciation of the historical buildings and redrooks. The roof in the underground parking is bound at Sokakari.
A mind palace is an imaginary architecture used for the sorting of memories. It is built over a long period of time by organizing mentally-visualized parts as a spatial whole. Wandering through its rooms, you recover what you already know and discover new connections.

The Mind Palace

Temppela Art Museum is a mind palace. You are invited to enter a world solely built by the subjective legs of a mental traveler. Entering the palace, this place soon becomes mysterious, strange, then wonderful through its rooms, you remember what you already know and discover new connections.

Yes, you find the main entrance of the Mind Palace at the end of the tunnel, and behind the entrance you go to the old granary and exit. The entrance to the court is slightly in the secondary hall. You immediately start examining yourself and looking around. At the door, in front of you there is a desk, speaking with a desk and a person behind it. And behind these you are the main leading-derp inside the Mind Palace.

A mind palace is an imaginary architecture used for the sorting of memories. It is built over a long period of time by organizing mentally-visualized parts as a spatial whole. Wandering through its rooms, you recover what you already know and discover new connections.

The Mind Palace

Temppela Art Museum is a mind palace. You are invited to enter a world solely built by the subjective legs of a mental traveler. Entering the palace, this place soon becomes mysterious, strange, then wonderful through its rooms, you remember what you already know and discover new connections.

Yes, you find the main entrance of the Mind Palace at the end of the tunnel, and behind the entrance you go to the old granary and exit. The entrance to the court is slightly in the secondary hall. You immediately start examining yourself and looking around. At the door, in front of you there is a desk, speaking with a desk and a person behind it. And behind these you are the main leading-derp inside the Mind Palace.
The Fragment and the Whole

Inside the big room, naked from the ceiling, a hammer stands where it is.

The museum staff have their own, small meeting room at ground level, and an office area is also located in the same entrance. The library was designed with a large window overlooking the square. Inside, the reception is in the multi-purpose hall. The big area contains the temporary exhibitions.

The multi-purpose area continues the Mind Palace theme. This principle for a small office has been reflected from the original intentions in the old museum.

The ground floor contains the main hall, a clear and expansive space for events and exhibits.
Inside

Meanwhile, the main guide runs a spiral through the temporary exhibition rooms. On the way, you find observation points near looking upwards towards the old pyramid tower with views in turns below. The inner walls move freely from floor to floor, and the area grid at each level on the north-south-west-east orientation of the area.

The rotating non-orthogonal curves produce massive floor plans that make side buildings, while the inner changing grid keeps on distorting you from the orientation of your actual world.

The top floor is a huge hall with a north-south-west-east grid of delusions. At the final center, you find a fourth observation point with a vice versa Pyynikintori, meaning you with your 360° view surrounding with an entirely new point of view.

NET AREA: 1806.00 m²
GROSS AREA: 3626.00 m²
VOLUME: 52710.00 m³
A view across Pohjola, a view along Laurel with Smart Works Housing on the left, and a view from Siltasaari.
Concrete

The facade is of bricks, rough concrete panels on the side with a hipped roof of black cement with the pieces of theatres on a rough black cement. In design, it reflects the Warhol's Meeting of novelts, to narrative, the interior of Tamper Art Museum.

The facade is an ancient form of mystery. Not knowing, any answers, yet welcoming to explore, mystery provides the architectural engagement as to a process of giving art - a suitable quality for an art museum. The building is clad with white polished stone, evoking the image of an elegant, sitting in the sun, towards the south.

The facade is of rough, brown rough, natural limestone facing, firmly affixed to its surrounding. The smooth surfaces of the walls are faced with a concrete slabs, with a slight, slight sheen. In building conditions, the rough stone appears like a building and more like an object, perhaps like the back of a coastline - or perhaps simply, like a big stone.
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### Opposite links

And how about the new museum or improved connections in the city... — it will be a great asset to the area.

The situation in Pyyniki will be

### Den Munster park

The existing, Munster Park is a great resource. It will be the heart of the public space development and a new focal point for the city. Munster Park, main urban space for the park and will

### The Museum typology

The spaces between the existing museum buildings can be used as the main urban space for the park and will

### Munster Park / the van’s

The existing, Munster Park is directly south of the main urban space. It can be used as the main urban space for the park and will

### Connections with the city

The Munster Park and Pyyniki will be connected to the main urban space. The supply will be

---
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The theme of the city will merge with the flow of the art museum creating a richly contextualized and shared experience. A clear connection between the museum and the urban environment is a necessity. The museum is a public place and it is always open and inviting to the public. The museum aims to be a place of meeting and exchange, a place for the community to come together and share ideas. The museum is a place for learning and growth, a place for the community to come together and share ideas.

The main entrance is located on the north side of the museum, offering a direct connection to the street. The museum is designed to be accessible to all, with ramps and elevators providing easy access to all levels of the building. The museum is designed to be energy-efficient, with solar panels and other sustainable features.

The museum is designed to be a place of learning and growth, offering a range of educational programs and events. The museum is also designed to be a place of community, with spaces for meetings and events. The museum is designed to be a place of inspiration, with art and architecture that stimulate thought and creativity.

The museum is a place of beauty, with a design that reflects the natural environment. The museum is designed to be a place of wonder, with spaces that inspire and delight. The museum is designed to be a place of peace, with quiet corners and peaceful spaces.

The museum is designed to be a place of innovation, with spaces that encourage creativity and imagination. The museum is designed to be a place of connection, with spaces that encourage interaction and exchange.

The museum is designed to be a place of discovery, with spaces that encourage exploration and discovery. The museum is designed to be a place of inspiration, with art and architecture that stimulate thought and creativity.

The museum is designed to be a place of beauty, with a design that reflects the natural environment. The museum is designed to be a place of wonder, with spaces that inspire and delight. The museum is designed to be a place of peace, with quiet corners and peaceful spaces.

The museum is designed to be a place of innovation, with spaces that encourage creativity and imagination. The museum is designed to be a place of connection, with spaces that encourage interaction and exchange.

The museum is designed to be a place of discovery, with spaces that encourage exploration and discovery. The museum is designed to be a place of inspiration, with art and architecture that stimulate thought and creativity.

The museum is designed to be a place of beauty, with a design that reflects the natural environment. The museum is designed to be a place of wonder, with spaces that inspire and delight. The museum is designed to be a place of peace, with quiet corners and peaceful spaces.

The museum is designed to be a place of innovation, with spaces that encourage creativity and imagination. The museum is designed to be a place of connection, with spaces that encourage interaction and exchange.

The museum is designed to be a place of discovery, with spaces that encourage exploration and discovery. The museum is designed to be a place of inspiration, with art and architecture that stimulate thought and creativity.

The museum is designed to be a place of beauty, with a design that reflects the natural environment. The museum is designed to be a place of wonder, with spaces that inspire and delight. The museum is designed to be a place of peace, with quiet corners and peaceful spaces.

The museum is designed to be a place of innovation, with spaces that encourage creativity and imagination. The museum is designed to be a place of connection, with spaces that encourage interaction and exchange.

The museum is designed to be a place of discovery, with spaces that encourage exploration and discovery. The museum is designed to be a place of inspiration, with art and architecture that stimulate thought and creativity.
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