

**International Ideas and Design Project Competition for Labor, Peace and
Democracy Memorial Square And Place
Jury Evaluation Report
March 1, 2020**

103 citizens lost their lives and hundreds were injured due to the terrorist bomb attack which happened just before the start of the march called as Labor, Peace and Democracy held in Ankara on October 10, 2015. The "**International Ideas and Design Project Competition for Labor, Peace and Democracy Memorial Square and Place**" was organized with an integrated approach by The Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects (TMMOB), Confederation of Public Employees' Trade Unions (KESK), Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey (DİSK), Turkish Medical Association (TTB) October 10 Peace and Solidarity Association (10 Ekim-Der) to reconsider the square where social loss happened as a kind of 'memorial square' for commemorating the people who lost their lives in the massacre, to remind and remember the crime of humanity.

The jury meeting began with a site visit on 29 February, 2020 at 8:30 am. at Ankara Station and its vicinity. Through the visit, the main spatial configuration of the city of Ankara regarding the Station complex, relations of city central areas of Ulus-Sıhhiye-Kızılay, the March of 10 October, the massacre materialised on that day and respectively ongoing trial process about massacre are all re-expressed and argued by the jury members. The place of explosion(s) and the existing memorial setting arrangement in the area were examined.

After the site visit, jury members gathered at the Chamber of Architects Conference Hall at 10 am. Rapporteurs conveyed the jury a brief information about the conformity of the participants' application documents with reference to the rules specified in the brief.

Baykan Günay is elected as the head of the jury, and then it was unanimously agreed that the participants who have some missing documents are all taken into the evaluation. Jury members shared their own opinions on criteria of evaluation. Discussions were done on those issues: how to handle the questions of the transportation system, implementation without a significant structural intervention in the project site, or comprehensive interventions that can be implemented in the future. Before the evaluation, each jury member was given an hour for individual examination.

1st Stage

In the 1st stage, voting was made for each project and 12 participants with pseudonyms SN2719, FR2401, 3S67R2, TA0508, SR0792, 06AŞ34, RB1020, KM1015, LR2118, RA1122, 28CLT1 and LZ1997 were eliminated.

2nd Stage

The jury voted each project individually and agreed upon the projects that should be evaluated in the 3rd round.

Project with pseudonym EK1995: 11-0 unanimity/ unanimously/ by consensus

Project with pseudonym EA7694: 11-0 unanimity

Project with pseudonym CX4826: 11-0 unanimity
Project with pseudonym GB1905: 11-0 unanimity
Project with pseudonym TN1037: 9-2 majority voting
Project with pseudonym C2705R: 11-0 unanimity
Project with pseudonym MK2108: 10-1 majority voting
Project with pseudonym PA2009: 8-3 majority voting
Project with pseudonym DD4875: 7-4 majority voting
Project with pseudonym BÍ1010: 11-0 unanimity
Project with pseudonym AB1730: 10-1 majority voting
Project with pseudonym BM1619: 9-2 majority voting
Project with pseudonym BA4721: 9-2 majority voting
Project with pseudonym DK2502: 11-0 unanimity
Project with pseudonym SA5201: 11-0 unanimity
Project with pseudonym UR2020: 9-2 majority voting
Project with pseudonym OO0103: 7-4 majority voting
Project with pseudonym AP2415: 8-3 majority voting
Project with pseudonym AL0909: 9-2 majority voting
Project with pseudonym ZA0906: 9-2 majority voting

At this stage, the evaluation concluded that six projects with pseudonyms DL4783, 51H087, CZ5579, GL7016, 0103PD, NP2658 remained for the next stage.

Before the 3rd round, the Organizing Committee and the jury members came together for the lunch break.

3rd Stage

Ela Babalik, as a member of the Advisor Jury, expressed her opinions/reflections on transportation and circulation situation of the site in the beginning of the 3rd round, underlining the below considerations:

In this respect, the project area:

- should be integrated into urban-scale transportation systems,
- should relate to the natural environment and the built environment,
- should provide accessibility for the passengers. The issues such as public transport, vehicle-taxi, parking lots, pedestrian and bicycle access should also be considered.

For transportation solutions, underground, entrances/exits, integration of public transportation systems and traffic explanation should be considered.

In the 3rd stage, all jury members individually declared their preferences for the first,, the second and the third place among the 6 projects chosen for prizes.

It is accepted that any project nominated for the 1st Prize would be given three points, for the 2nd Prize two points and for the 3rd Prize one point, and then the scores of all projects were calculated.

The project with the pseudonym **NP2658**, acquiring 26 points and the majority of votes, was awarded by the **First Prize**.

Jury Evaluation for the First Prize:

The project treated the area by minimalist interventions carrying out respect to the sad event. The area, organized by small-scale interventions, offers powerful images to raise awareness of the memory of October 10. As the project is based on a landscape arrangement, it is imagined that the leaves surrounding the trees in autumn will provide a refreshing effect on the memory. Trees covered with bronze plates symbolizing eternity portray that life continues, and hope survives in the place. The design of the monumental setting of the project via living landscape elements was found very impressive and successful. The choice of the type of tree has been appreciated regarding philosophical connotations and practicality of the idea. The approach of the project regarding cyclical and linear time (indications/illustrations of how trees will grow over time and with respect to seasonal changes) has been found successful. Although the proposed observation terrace is acclaimed controversial, it has positive aspects considering spatial fictions for memorials. Besides, it was observed that access to the station building by vehicles was not adequately handled.

Suggestions:

- Issues about transport and circulation, parking areas and sound control should be reconsidered.
- Inscriptions on the ground are proposed by bronze material. However, the complications about preserving this material on site should be taken into consideration, and material research should be conducted on this subject.
- In order to provide the trunk and roots of the trees proposed in the design to get enough light and air, the detailed design of the material surrounding the trunk/root areas is recommended to be re-evaluated by the relevant experts.
- With regards to the original nature of the design element, the importance of periodic maintenance of the material is emphasized.
- Present vegetal texture in the project area should also be taken into consideration.

Projects with the pseudonym of 0103PD and GL7016, which received 11 EQUAL POINTS in weighted scoring, were re-voted by the jury members.

By means of 6 votes, the project with the pseudonym of **0103PD** was awarded the **Second Prize**.

Jury Evaluation: The project has been embraced with an integrative approach for the disciplines of architecture, city planning, and landscape architecture. The designed monument goes along the memory throughout creating a strong architectural identity. The project area has been conceived in an integrated manner with its surroundings, and the meeting place has been defined. The scale, layout and spatial quality of the memorial space proposed by the project were all found successful. Moreover, the fact that the square was designed with an integrated approach and priority of pedestrian movement in the site was appreciated. On the

other hand, the fact that vehicle access to the station building entrance was not considered, therefore it was found problematic and the monument proposed in the pool was acclaimed as controversial.

The project with a pseudonym of **GL7016**, which received 5 votes, was awarded the **Third Prize**.

Jury Evaluation: Solutions proposed by the project regarding the reconstruction of the existing intersection as a square, its integrated design approach, and pedestrian and vehicle traffic have been valued highly. The scale and distribution of the proposed vertical elements were both remarkable enough and too rare not to prevent pedestrian circulation were all evaluated positively. Although the commemorative place proposed underground was impressive, it was seen as an extreme intervention and the relation of the points of entry and exit with the square was figured weak.

Projects with pseudonyms of **DL4783**, **51H087** and **CZ5579** have been awarded with **Equivalent Mentions**.

Jury Evaluation:

DL4783: For the project with a pseudonym of DL4783, although the scale of the proposed intervention and the spatial quality in three dimensions are valued, the placement of the recommended curved walls is considered random.

51H087: The strictness of the intervention that is made by the project with a pseudonym of 51H087 and the optimism of the scenario is found out consistent and positive.

CZ5579: The elements used in the organization of the project with a pseudonym of CZ5579 are arbitrary, yet their changes over time are positively valued. Access to the station building is negative in terms of pedestrian and vehicle circulation.

AWARDED PROJECTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF AUTHORS

First Prize: Project with the pseudonym NP2658

Pınar Kesim Aktaş - Architect (Team leader)

Özge Uysal - Urban Planner

Mehmet Cemil Aktaş - Landscape Architect

Şeyma Kahraman - Landscape Architect

Ecem Sevin - Landscape Architect

Rumeysa Konuk - Landscape Architect

Bengisu Doğru - Landscape Architect

Nagihan Damgacı - Landscape Architect

Okan Mutlu Akpınar - Landscape Architect

Hüseyin Hilmi Kezer - Landscape Architect

Lokman Turunç - Landscape Architect

Emre Gökçe - Landscape Architect

Second Prize: Project with the pseudonym 0103PD

Doruk Görkem Özkan - Landscape Architect

Berker Cem Bozbař - Architect
Beyzanur Akkuř - Urban Planner
Çisem Seyhan- Urban Planner
Regaip Yılmaz - Urban Planner
Selçuk Özkaya - Landscape Architect
Emre Kul - Landscape Architect

Third Prize: Project with the pseudonym GL7016
Süleyman Can Çinkılıç - Landscape Architect (Team leader)
Halil Erođlu - Architect
Bařak İncekara - Urban Planner
Ferdi İnanlı, Burak Bař - Landscape Architect

Honorable Mention: Project with the pseudonym DL4783
Cem Üstün - Architect (Team leader)
Öykü Arda - Architect
Nur Kardelen Öztürk - Urban Planner
Melike Üresin - Landscape Architect

Honorable Mention: Project with the pseudonym 51H087
Görkem Demirok - Architect (Team leader)
İzzet Furkan Gezegen - Architect
Didem Türk - Urban Planner
Bahar Aslan - Landscape Architect

Honorable Mention: Project with the pseudonym CZ5579
Cemre Önertürk - Architect (Team leader)
Zeynep Ece řahin - Architect
Ecem Kutlay - Urban Planner
Gülçin Özdemir - Landscape Architect

JURY MEMBERS

Prof. Dr. Jale Erzen – Art Historian – Middle East Technical University

Prof. Dr. Baykan Günay – Urban Planner – TED University

Prof. Dr. Güven Arif Sargın – Architect – Middle East Technical University

Prof. Dr. Heba Safey Eldeen – Architect – Misr International University

Prof. Dr. İclal Dinçer – Architect – Urban Planner – Yıldız Technical University

Prof. Dr. Stavros Stavrides – Architect – National Technical University of Athens

Assoc. Dr. Bülent Batuman – Architect – Bilkent University

Dr. Gaye Çulcuoğlu – Landscape Architect – Bilkent & Atılım University

Dr. Jean – François Perouse – Urbanist – French Research Institute

Dr. Jerzy Grochulski – Architect – Warsaw University of Technology

Metin Yurdanur – Sculptor