

# 2019 IFLA Student Design Competition - NORWAY

## Jury Report

Dr. Beverly A Sandalack, Chair

9 June 2019

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The IFLA student design competition was organized in conjunction with the 56th IFLA World Congress to be held in Oslo, Norway in September 2019. The Norwegian Landscape Architects (NLA) was the hosting IFLA component and the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU) the hosting organization. The jury process took place on 5 and 6 June at the offices of the Norwegian Landscape Architects as arranged by Marit Hovi, NLA Office, and with with additional organization and administration provided by Ingrid Merete Odegard, NMBU, and Sally Robertshaw, IFLA Executive Secretary, and they also coordinated the administrative review of the submissions (eligibility, payment of fees, etc.) prior to the convening of the jury. Anita Veiseth, Ola Bettum, and their colleagues developed the competition brief to reflect the congress theme “Common Ground.” The organization and administration of the competition entails an extraordinary amount of work, and the hosting organizations and individuals are sincerely thanked for their work.

The jury for this competition was:

- **Marius Fiskevold**, PhD, MNLA, Oslo, Norway
- **Beverly Sandalack**, PhD, FCSLA, MCIP, RPP, Professor and Associate Dean, University of Calgary, Canada,; Chair of the Jury and Chair of the IFLA Competitions Committee
- A third jury member was to participate but was unexpectedly unable to travel on the first day of the jury.

### 2. COMPETITION PROCESS

A total of 254 submissions were received electronically in response to the call for submissions and competition brief, which asked students to address the conference theme “Common Ground” with a specific site in Oslo. The local working group reviewed the submissions for eligibility, assembled the entries for review, anonymized the entries for the jury, and coordinated with the IFLA office regarding entry fee payment. The administrative review by non-jury members is required to ensure that the jury process is blind. In this process, approximately 40 entries were disqualified for administrative reasons (no entry form, no signature from the dean, inclusion of the dean or professor on the project team, no fee received). During the jury process, several others were eliminated for non-conformance with the requirements such as number of pages or orientation of pages. Several projects were eliminated because the program dean was included in the project team or because the projects were submitted by the dean via an incorrect email rather than what was required in the project brief. This is unfortunate for the students preparing the work, as it is not possible to make exceptions to the regulations regarding eligibility.

Jury members convened at 9:00 am, 5 June, at the NLA Offices, and the deliberations concluded at 2:00 pm, 6 June. The jury members discussed the general process that they would employ to review the submissions and select the winners, the criteria for evaluation, the project site and its characteristics, and agreed that the competition results would remain confidential until such time as the IFLA President authorizes the announcement of the awards.

Each jury member reviewed all of the submissions individually in successive rounds, eventually reducing the selection to the top 15 projects, which were then printed in A3 size. The printed projects were reviewed again, and discussed in more detail, and the prize winners were determined. The jury was unanimous in their decision of the top 3 prizes, and 3 projects for Jury Special Mention.

### **3. AWARDS**

The jury is pleased to recommend to James Hayter, IFLA President, the following for awards:

#### **1st Prize – Group Han Prize for Landscape Architecture \$1,500 US**

**“Balance of Situation: Landscape Design Strategies, Urban Intensive Transition Areas”**

**Jiang Han Yang  
Zhou Ming Jie  
Wei Zhong Mian**

**Nanjing Forestry University  
China**

The site design is very clear and well developed, and resulted in the definition of various spaces. It could be built in stages. The common ground is accessible by neighbours, bicyclists, and others. This project addressed the various edge conditions and extended beyond the site to include some of the context. The project considered the previous farm function and proposed urban agricultural uses. The site plan brings the various spaces and uses together into a united concept. It is graphically very strong, and the jury notes the clear and strong design of the various spaces, and of the site as a whole.

#### **2nd Prize – Group Han Commendation Award for Landscape Architecture \$1,000**

**“Urban Life Laboratory - Self-service garden with free constructing spaces”**

**Zhuang Hang  
Hu Ersi**

**Beijing Forestry University  
China**

This project considered the previous function of the match factory in a new interpretation. They addressed the context and edges, and extended the landscape plan beyond the site boundary into the garden blocks and outside the farm buildings. There was a good articulation of the interior courtyard. The project considered how the site would be used throughout the year and for different purposes and seems flexible. The presentation is graphically competent and persuasive.

#### **3rd Prize – Norwegian Association of Landscape Architects Merit Award \$500 US**

**“Et sted a vaere”**

**Ricardo Pala  
Marta Terlim  
Pedro Casalta**

**Universidade de Evora  
Portugal**

The strength of this project was its clear design. Although not developed in detail, the plan convinced the jury that the public space would be properly proportioned and human-scaled. Among so many projects that were overly complicated, this submission succeeded in its simplicity and clarity. The students are encouraged to develop their skills in detailed design so as to complement the conceptual abilities.

### **Jury Special Mention**

In addition to the top three prize winners, the jury selected three projects for special mention. Although they did not receive a top prize, they were commendable for various aspects of their work.

#### **“The Idyllic Ideal”**

**Liu Hui  
Zheng Anjun  
Ma Xiaoyi  
Yuan Zhengxiong  
Wang Yuan**

**Southwestern Forestry University, School of Landscape Architecture and Horticultural Science  
China**

#### **“Push the Cube - community park model of multiple symbiosis”**

**Yi Hou  
Youjin Chen**

**Hainan University  
China**

#### **‘Moving the History Boxes’**

**Shi Zhancheng  
Li Xiaowan  
Wang Yiquan  
Qiao Qijin**

**Soochow University, Suzhou  
China**

## **4. STATISTICS**

**Total number of entries: 254**

Distribution by country (there were some duplicate entries, and some jointly entered by students from two countries):

Australia	2
Bolivia	1
China	194
France	1

Germany	1
Italy	2
Japan	2
Norway	1
Poland	6
Portugal	3
Sri Lanka	2
Taiwan	1
Netherlands	1
UK	3
USA	11

## 5. NOTES

The jury makes the following general comments, which are offered for future competitions, and also as general considerations to students and the educational programs:

- Overall, the jury noted the strong graphic presentation of the work.
  - Many of the projects were not very site specific, and had what appeared to be generic solutions consisting of pattern generation rather than reflections on the particular characteristics of the site.
  - Many of the projects seemed to include much analysis at a very large scale (for example, population statistics for Norway as a whole) and did not focus enough on the detailed analysis of the site and its context.
  - The jury noted that many of the projects were highly complicated, and did not necessarily address the real site conditions or the needs of the people in the neighbourhood. The students are encouraged to try to understand how to bring more of the context into the site.
  - Many of the projects seemed to struggle with understanding the relevant scale of the site.
  - Many projects attempted to use technologies as a solution. Students are encouraged to use technology to support landscape and the people who inhabit it, rather than to dominate the site with technology.
  - Again this year, many of the projects were extremely dense in terms of information, and without a clear hierarchy and synthesis of the most relevant information. Students are very adept at many aspects of graphic communication, but the solutions that were illustrated often appeared to be generic and not responsive to the actual site conditions.
  - Few of the projects addressed the topic of “common ground” in a sophisticated way. Common ground implies that what is shared among human beings is more important than emphasizing categories which only serve to reinforce prejudices.
  - As with many previous years, few of the entries exhibited a clear design process. Students are encouraged to include a rationale for their concepts, and some diagrammatic indication of site analysis, issue definition and conceptual development.
  - The jury continues to note the high number of submissions from China, indicating strong promotion and support of the competition in the schools. Other regions are still under-represented. IFLA should continue to encourage broad global participation. Only 15 countries participated this year.
  - The registration form should be revised so that it can be completed on line, and so that it can then be used to generate the spreadsheet of projects. Currently this needs to be done by hand, and it is extremely time consuming for the organizers.
- The jury strongly advises IFLA to take the jury recommendations under consideration, as a matter of real urgency. The students are the future of our profession, and it is imperative that participation across the regions be encouraged. It is impossible to evaluate how well, or how poorly, landscape architecture education is faring in most areas of the world, as there is little or no participation in this international competition from most of the countries.**