DUTCH JURY REPORT

The jury was selected by personal appointment at the behest of the organisers and consisted of the following six members.

Dick van Gameren, architect, professor TUD (chairman)
Pascal Flammer, architect,
Nanne de Ru, architect*
Arjan Dingsté, architect
Gerald Lindner, structural engineer, assistant professor TUE
Philip Allin architect, writer (secretary)

*Listed jury member not present at jury session

[introduction]

The Concrete Design Competition, a bi-annual competition open to students of architecture, industrial design and similar disciplines. In the fourth edition, the Dutch jury received 65 entries from groups of one, two or three students. Each entry consisted of one or two A1 panels. The entrants were all students of the Technical Universities of Delft and Eindhoven.

The theme of the competition was “Monolithic - exploring versatility”. Of the 65 proposals five were ultimately selected as winners, with two honourable mentions as well as a top three overall. The three winners of the competition receive €2.000, €1.500 and €1.000 prize money. Besides this, the winners are invited to an exclusive seminar hosted by curator Valerio Olgiati in Istanbul in August 2010.

[1st round]

In the first round, each jury member evaluated all the entries separately. A shortlist of no more than 15 proposals was drawn up by each member and compiled into one list. General remarks on this round were also made.

AD: Large variation in quality of the proposals. Many thematic similarities were obvious. Also, the plasticity was often shown, whereas the monolithic qualities of concrete are perhaps not so clearly presented.
GL: Proposals seem to be divided into theme or object. Do all students understand the problems and complexity of scale? This is only apparent in some proposals.
PF: Many experiments in modularity and prefab solutions. Lots of fun with concrete, not always in line with the ideas of curator V. Olgiati.
PA: Saw five categories generally in the work: architecture, design, education, research and technology. Variety in quality visible in all these fields.
DvG: The theme of versatility is hardly addressed by most proposals. Still, there are many interesting projects, some of which are quite poetic.

First round long-list (25 entries):

code	votes	code	votes
AR135	2	MC008	3
AV541	2	MM999	4
BK007	3	NI511	2
BS312	1	PL474	2
DS015	3	RB304	1
EJ580	1	RR023	1
FF015	1	SB638	3
FJ508	2	SH250	3
ID720	2	SJ218	1
IR839	1	TS001	1
JG785	1	TS986	2
JJ012	2		
KK115	2		
PH000	1		

[2nd round]

In the second round, the 25 selected proposals were studied further by each jury member. Subsequently, an oral voting round was held to select a shortlist of thirteen projects to be examined in more detail.

An extra mention should be made for project TS001. While not a serious entry to the competition, this proposal of a monumental dust cloud is an ironic comment on the paradoxical nature of the competition brief. It is also timely considering the sudden global impact of the (volcanic) dust cloud in recent months.

During the second round selection, a short-list was compiled, based on a plenary discussion by all jury members on each entry.

Second round short-list (13 entries):

AV541 – Adaptable Versatility
An experiment in flexible formwork that attempts to use vacuum casting to create new shapes.

Jury: Intrigued by the proposal; has a 'soft' feeling to it. Best of the various form-work entries, but neither highly innovative nor entirely convincing.

BK007 - *pliable*CRETE
An investigation into pliable concrete based on a triangular mould and an external matrix.

Jury: It seems a very versatile proposal, though not as pliable as the explanation suggests. How are the connections made between the panels - through hinges? Though it is an exploration into light and flexibility, it doesn't convince the entire jury.

DS015 – Defiant Shadow
A playful exercise in optical versatility, which uses the triangle as a basic shape and tessellates multiple units to extend the principle.

Jury: The casts work well and the reasoning is clear. The idea is fundamentally scale-less. The 'facade' could be a drawing at any scale and it does not make a strong contribution to the proposal.

FF015 – Concrete Poetry

A subtle and modest suggestion of staining concrete with ink to create legible prints on concrete surfaces.

Jury: Admirable for its simplictity and clear presentation. Has a Gerhard Richter feel to it. But, due to durability issues, possibly a sub-optimal solution to the technical problem of printing/etching on hard materials.

JJ012 – Where Concrete Belongs

A clear, bold suggestion of a kind of pavilion shaped like a rough swaying block on steel stilts, in a presentation that has poetic undertones.

Jury: An intriguing story doesn't hide the fact that the proposal would not be as flexible as suggested: the fairy tale would have to be anchored.

MC008 – Monocomb

A honey-comb structure that is presented as a structural model for facades and freestanding structures.

Jury: One of a number of 'scale-less' solutions; the reverse pyramid structure is intriguing and poetic though the jury doubts the feasibility of the project, which is split between two ideas on two panels. The proposed facade is not convincing and could just as well have been omitted.

MM999 – Simplifying Space

An integrated groove that can be used as a slider or hook-rail system, with an elementary description of the steel profile used in the casting.

Jury: A pleasingly simple and clear idea. However, the concept is neither new nor fully worked out. It uses the qualities of steel rather than of concrete and may require significant plasterwork to hide cracks. More could have been achieved with this idea.

NI511 – Concrete World

A playful form-work concept that investigates space and function in a proposal for a children's toy, that suggests a structure that could work in various sizes.

Jury: A toy to play with, rather than in; perhaps a stronger concept if it would be scaled up. Certainly fun for children though the choice for concrete on the small scale is somewhat arbitrary.

PL474 – Concrete Memory

A concrete memory game that uses the natural process of formwork hardening to produce pairs of tiles that can be analysed by touch or sight.

Jury: A well-conceived approach to the 'game' aspect presented clearly. Concrete is not absolutely required for the concept to work but its qualities are used effectively here. The proposal takes a clever and ironic stance with regards to the contemporary, much sought-after quality of "unique" as opposed to "copied" - the normal result of traditional formwork.

SB638 – apPEELing

Re-use of the mould is encouraged through specific design of a garden set consisting of a concrete block and a 'peel' that provides an extra dimension to the process and finishing.

Jury: A complicated process that is nevertheless well reasoned and which attempts to effectively re-use formwork. Though the design is questionable and perhaps extended too far, the process is well thought out.

SH250 – The Oil Bath

An experiment in use oil as a shape-retainer for extruded concrete, with examples of how the procedure could lead to a 'stringy concrete' with new applications.

Jury: Interesting experiment that modestly describes its own shortcomings. The product looks nothing like the ideas in the renders but the investigative nature and process are commendable, which led to discussion within the jury.

SJ218 – In the Nature of Concrete

A research project into the nature of concrete that uses wax-moulding to create particular concrete surfaces with various textures.

Jury: A comprehensive look at a well-intentioned process that leads to pretty images of a pebbled structure with a natural, timeless quality. However, the jury doubts the practicality of the proposal. It also seems unlikely that the concept could be scaled up effectively.

TS986 – Hidden Reflections / Bleeding Concrete

A suspended, rounded concrete surface that is fed with water to alter its appearance, making it look darker or lighter, and matte or glossy, as required.

Jury: An exciting proposal that is full of suggestiveness and mystery. Here, the abstraction of the scale is a bonus and the process allows multiple readings into its function and workings.

[3rd round]

The option was open in the last round for jury-members to introduce a wild-card - either an entry they had previously overlooked, or one which had been voted out in the earlier stages. This turned out to be unnecessary. After a final session of evaluation, the final five projects were selected. Judging of the proposals proceeded via a points system, with points awarded 5-4-3-2-1 in order; the three proposals with the highest scores would win. The scoring was as follows.

	jury member						
	# 1	#2	#3	#4	#5	total	rank
BK007	5	4	2	3	1	15	3rd
JJ012	3	3	5	4	4	19	2nd
PL474	2	2	1	2	3	10	hon
SH250	1	1	3	1	2	8	hon
TS986	4	5	4	5	5	23	1st

[honourable mentions]

PL474 – Concrete Memory

This memory card game is a well thought out proposal that uses the simplicity of a case mould with a sheet of textile to produce the results. The tiles are exact mirror-images of each other and work well. Perhaps a similar result could be achieved using other materials; equally, many other possibilities are suggested (as, perhaps, facade panelling). It is the best example in the ‘playful’ category as it uses copied uniqueness as a concept. The craftsman’s imprecision results in a high-precision tiling system that consists of a tile and its reverse. By combining the two the project deserves an honourable mention for its not-too-serious approach to functionality.

SH250 – The Oil Bath

The oil-bath experiment suffers from investigating process as well as use of the material. Essentially for the results the oil is less important than the concrete mixture. The jury debated as to the procedure, counter pressures and use of other liquids and the discussion is worth an honourable mention. Though the proposal may fail at the practical level, the fundamental experiment into novelty is commendable and the jury awards this proposal the ‘nutty professor award’.

[winners]

BK007 - *pliable*CRETE

A very attractive proposal that truly attempts to unite the concepts of the versatile and the monolithic. The physical flexibility combines with poetic imagery and translucence that is realised in a working model. However, it overreaches in its application as a building 'cover' and is not entirely convincing. More work could be put in to the hinges that allow freedom in the construction; but the play of light, material and construction is laudable. Although the examples of the project are a little weak, though there is a lot of potential to the idea. Perhaps more could be shown of the implementation and the understanding of the material's workings as being more like a fabric, a structural membrane with ditto consequences. The third prize is awarded for an interesting experiment which could be developed further in the future.

JJ012 – Where Concrete Belongs

The contrast of a brutalist sculptural block of 'floating' concrete with the story line on the panel is intriguing. Though the idea would not work as proposed - the steel construction would either collapse or become completely stiff - this fairy tale concept is well thought out and is presented as a powerful statement on the characteristics of the material. By playing with the size, shape and texture of the material the concept is developed as a pavilion in which the visitor would consider the nature of concrete. It is one of the few proposals, which won't encounter problems in scaling up from a model to full-size project. However, assuming the steel holds, the construction would be extremely stiff and so the concept does not entirely hold. Snow and other natural conditions may affect the pavilion too. Still, the second prize is awarded for the contradictory statement that is made effectively and presented clearly.

TS986 – Hidden Reflections / Bleeding Concrete

The winning project plays with multiple themes and contradictions. A rounded surface hangs over a room, suggesting it could be part of a sphere. Perhaps it is only a permeable, suspended membrane; liquid seeping through its pores? The proposal intelligently tricks our sense of perception, our wish to see more than there might be and our desire for context. Its position, size and smoothness all contribute to the mysteriousness of the object. Its colour changes due to water trickling through, drying and weathering over a period of time. It is a kind of 'bleeding', as the proposal suggests, that can be seen as scary, or as playful. The design process is strong and the principle can be implemented on small or large projects. The bleed can work at different scales and this contributes to the effectiveness of the proposal. It is a magical, secretive process that intelligently combines the versatility of multiple readings with the mystery of the monolith. Our deserved first prize winner.

[conclusion, general remarks]

The jury was pleasantly surprised by the large number of different entries. Though the quality varied, and there were obviously some which had been developed over a period of time, the inventiveness of the students is appreciated.

About half the proposals were presented on two panels rather than one. Many of these became less clear as a result. Often, it seemed as though each panel contained a separate idea. This is detrimental to the quality of the entry.

It turned out after the judging that all five winning entries were TUE projects; further, that all of them had been submitted by males.

It has been a pleasure to assess and discuss the entries of the Concrete Design Competition for 2009/2010.

Dick van Gameren
chairman

Philip Allin
secretary

	AA001	Jacob Lindeijer	TU Delft
	AA158	Astrid Heijnen	TU Delft
	AM105	A. van Mourik	TU Eindhoven
	AR135	Arnoud Reinke	TU Eindhoven
	AV541	Jerroen van Aerle	TU Eindhoven
	BA115	Beerd Gieteling	TU Eindhoven
	BB002	Jacob Lindeijer	TU Delft
	BB311	Bob Blom	TU Delft
	BE059	Anne Bekker	TU Delft
	BH161	Paul Crombach	TU Delft
THIRD PRIZE	BK007	Bjorn Kasandikromo	TU Eindhoven
	BS312	Bram Seijsener	TU Eindhoven
	BT073	Stephan de Waard	TU Delft
	CB402	Kim Veldman	TU Delft
	CD001	Roy Wijte	TU Delft
	CI993	Tom Schakelaar	TU Delft
	CJ021	Chris Kruit	TU Delft
	CQ113	Marinke Davelaar	TU Delft
	DL121	Daan Lans	TU Delft
	DS015	Renske van Dieren	TU Delft
	EJ283	Evelina Juzbasjeva	TU Delft
	EJ580	Daan Janssen	TU Delft
	FF015	Milou Foole	TU Delft
	FJ101	Floor-Jan van Schaik	TU Delft
	FJ508	Sofieke Jagtman	TU Delft
	FW001	Johannes Akkermans	TU Delft
	FW817	Guangjong Liu	TU Delft
	GJ040	Michiel Jobse	TU Eindhoven
	HC111	Huub Larink	TU Delft
	HE137	Rob Verhaegh	TU Eindhoven
	HH507	Hilde Haverman	TU Delft
	ID720	Iggie Dekkers	TU Eindhoven
	IR839	Ian Rieken	TU Delft
	JD201	Jeroen Donkers	TU Eindhoven
	JG785	Jeroen Groenen	TU Eindhoven
SECOND PRIZE	JJ012	Nathaniël Rijsmus	TU Eindhoven
	JK153	Jesse van Koppen	TU Delft
	KK115	Koen Kegel	TU Delft
	KL926	Ka-Lai Cheung	TU Delft
	KW142	Kristine Koning	TU Eindhoven
	LA199	Lukas Jespers	TU Delft
	MC008	Daan Heijn	TU Delft
		Timo Cardol	TU Delft
		Michiel van Hennik	TU Delft
	MI198	Malik Tas	TU Delft
	MK378	Merian Koekkoek	TU Eindhoven

	MK989	Maarten Adriaan Kornet	TU Delft
	MM999	Milou Foole	TU Delft
	MN285	Mirjam Roth	TU Eindhoven
	MS272	Marieke Sijm	TU Eindhoven
	MW046	Max Willems	TU Delft
	NI511	Niek Marks	TU Delft
	PH000	Pieter Honcoop	TU Eindhoven
HONORABLE MENTION	PL474	Jeroen Donkers	TU Eindhoven
		Beerd Gieteling	TU Eindhoven
	PR750	Philippe Rol	TU Eindhoven
	RB304	Ran Berman	TU Delft
	RE431	Lennert van den Boom	TU Delft
	RR023	Rens van Dijk	TU Delft
	SB628	Sophietje Broeken	TU Delft
HONORABLE MENTION	SH250	Sven van der Heiden	TU Eindhoven
	SJ218	Simon Jaspers	TU Delft
	TB342	Ka Shun Cheung	TU Delft
	TG530	Tim Geraedts	TU Delft
	TS001	Matheus Storms	TU Eindhoven
FIRST PRIZE	TS986	Matheus Storms	TU Eindhoven
	VA686	Vincent van den Aardweg	TU Delft
	XY244	Loek Amedeo Zuijderwijk	TU Delft