

**STUDENT UNION OF TAMPERE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE SPACE COMPETITION IN PIENTEOLLISUUSTALO
11.1. – 1.3.2019**

EVALUATION TRANSCRIPT



Aerial 3d view: Google Maps (2018), maps.google.fi

1 JURY

Members of the jury for the Office Space Competition in Pienteollisuustalo were:

Markku Karjalainen, associate professor, Tampere University School of Architecture

Satu Huuhka, adjunct professor, Tampere University School of Architecture

Jenni Poutanen, University teacher, Tampere University School of Architecture

Mikael Malkamäki, CEO, Karpek Ltd

Verna Hahtola, board member, Karpek Ltd

Venla Monter, Secretary General, Student Union of Tampere University

Petra Oksa, board member, Student Union of Tampere University

Sohvi Hyvärinen, member of the representative council, Student Union of Tampere University

The secretary for the jury has been Elina Luotonen, a selected student of architecture from the Tampere University.

2 COMPETITION BRIEF AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

This competition for the renewal of the office spaces of Student Union of Tampere University was arranged by the Student Union of Tampere University and Karpek Ltd in collaboration with Tampere University School of Architecture.

The purpose of the competition was to provide high-quality, versatile and feasible solutions for the reorganization and redevelopment of the office space interior owned by Karpek Ltd in Pienteollisuustalo in Tampere. The aim was to create a flexible space, which is adaptive to the functional changes serving the union's own needs but also enables leasing to other operators presented with three functional scenarios. Materials, workplace design and furnishing solutions were to play an essential role in creating an innovative and seamless whole.

Altogether twelve proposals took part in the competition from which five were chosen to be awarded by the jury. From the five proposals, the top three were given 1st, 2nd and 3rd prizes and the other two gained honorary mentions. The jury had a difficult task to identify any clear winner as the proposals were of equally high level. All the awarded competition proposals were made by students of Tampere University School of Architecture.

In their judging the jury paid especial attention to the architectural ideas suitable for the usage of the premises and the quality and innovation of suggested scenarios enabling the office to be divided and leased out to other operators. The new office ideally increases productivity, creativity and cooperation as well as contributes to the well-being and comfort of the people using the space. Functionality and adaptability of the spaces were evaluated carefully as multi-usage plays an important role in creating long-lasting solutions for the premises. In total the jury concentrated more on the creative ideas and general feasibility of the proposals, rather than the flawlessness of the details.

Presumably due to the small scale of the competition area, the level of the competition entries turned out rather homogenous although the concept ideas displayed a lot of variation. Most of the proposals showed similar deficiencies in functional and coherently placed zones. Movement between spaces was not always fluent or intuitive and caused in many proposals unnecessary crossing of workplaces or quiet areas and the hierarchy of the different spaces was not always clear or thought through. Office solutions that caused the visitors to wander off the public zone or did not provide an unmistakable entrance area with a reception were considered unsatisfactory.

Plausible division of the office between operators was overall lacking and some proposals excluded the three scenarios altogether. The jury was looking for a proposal with functional scenarios where the quality and effectiveness of spaces did not suffer visibly or vary too much from another due to the division. In some

proposals the office spaces lost their charm and feasibility when separated to two or more operators. Many also required additional toilets and kitchens to be planned which does not fully support multi-use planning of the space as a whole.

The jury statements for individual proposals are presented in the following section. The proposals were numbered randomly by the secretary and do not suggest any preferred order.

3. JURY STATEMENT

1 HEMMA

HEMMA takes a brave and architecturally distinctive approach in transforming the old office hierarchy and sorting the various functions anew. The strong and clear concept involves three wooden boxes that behold a variety of working spaces and also function as furniture-like elements themselves. The materials and colours present new life but are composed and generic enough to enable leasing out to other operators. The boxes create a natural and sound-isolated zoning that leaves the moving about within the office follow intuitively.

The jury finds the possibilities created by the structures exciting yet disagrees about the necessity of the increased amount of hallway area. The foldable wallstructures lend out further adaptability to the spaces within the boxes and a bigger conference room can be easily achieved to suit various purposes. The conference room, however has no natural light and the positioning of the whole western box is rather questionable. The areas and their functions outside of the boxes could have been further developed as a lot of room is left for lounging and less for work-supporting usage. In scenario one, the working environment generally emphasizes connectedness and cooperation within the TREY teams and the entrance lobby with a separated reception is well-placed, attractive and functional. The division of the office space suggested by HEMMA offers a balanced solution, which enables the same comforts, concept and quality to other operators renting the space.

HEMMA's graphical looks created some difficulties and misunderstandings in interpretation especially with the rich usage of colours and amount of text in the floorplans. The innovative and dynamic concept however, is carried out harmoniously through the proposal creating a seamless whole that with slight changes is feasible for actualization.

2 Kehys

Kehys clears away the existing walls with a radical take, creating with only a few new structures a simplistic and easily adaptable office space with credible hierarchy. The wide and clear zones are well-placed and a merit to the proposal although moving between the zones could still be developed further. The proposal suggests minimalistic furniture design to pinpoint the usage of the spaces and has used lighting to highlight the prominent beams and create variable atmosphere enabling multi-use in the public zone.

In Kehys the various workspaces allow the employees to find mood- and work suited spots to be either creative, connected or concentrated. In the first scenario the office is divided into a public-, semi-public and private zones, each separated from another by a skillful use of a sound blocking buffer element or room selection. However some unwanted traffic is created when a visitor needs to enter the conference space and when the kitchen is being used. Generally the kitchen placement and size was considered unsatisfactory as it is too close to the working units and provides no real break area if the conference room is being used during lunch hours. Also the unfinished planning of the reception area did not please the jury although the placement would have been ideal to create a service office closed to the public. The three scenarios left some questions unanswered but the main idea is credible and the separate entrances could be realised during the first renovation procedure.

Although Kehys could profit from developing the graphical output when presenting its key ideas and for example in providing further depth in the section plans, it is a strong and skillful proposal with high potential to be actualized.

3 BOXIT

BOXIT is a conceptually functional proposal where the zoning is done reasonably fluently, however some disturbances might occur in the movement between the public and semi-private zones and in the placement of the kitchen in the middle of the office. This might give off noise and smells to the working places nearby. The proposal has well analysed and recognized the problems of the existing floor plan and how they do not support modern working methods or well-being of the employees.

The division of offices to two operators creates a decrease in quality for both of the units as the toilets for the smaller unit lie in the public hallway and the entrance to the bigger office unit is not attractive or natural. In case the Student Union would occupy the whole space the possibility of a proper reception apart from a mere desk does not exist. The conference room remains windowless.

BOXIT gives off a professional touch as the technical details and air ventilation have been considered skillfully without compromising on the cost-effectiveness.

4 TREYffice

TREYffice is a daring and detailed proposal to create more openness and communality in the modern office. The proposal has strong emphasis on the TREY colours not only in the zoning but also in the interior design to flash off the brand values and the new identity. The office space provides a variation of working spots and situations to enable a creative and stimulating working environment.

The zoning of TREYffice is successfully planned and the movement within the office fluent and intuitive. No unnecessary traffic or sounds filter from the public zone to the private zone and the break room is closed off from disturbing the working colleagues. The two conference rooms are qualitative and well-placed. The acoustics have been obviously considered when planning an open-office solution. The problems arise when the discussion turns into adaptability of space and division to other operators which due to lack of graphical material created confusion and disappointment among the jury. The scenario-planning seems to focus solely on the Student Union using the entire space and the extensive use of TREY colours are rather dominating and not flexible in catering to other operators tastes. This lowered the proposals merits as the functional scenarios and adaptability was what the jury was looking for.

5 LOKO

LOKO has a fresh and innovative take in designing a playful working environment that focuses heavily in using the furnishing to pinpoint functional zones. The proposal aims to increase creativity and collaboration which is shown in the open-office plan with a variety of shared workplaces. Small telephone cubicles are used as room dividers and as an option to draw back. These however are not discussed in further detail graphically and the jury is not convinced about the amount and real usage of the elements.

LOKO emphasizes the easier adaptability of its floor plan which might be the case for a scenario where only one operator is using the office with guest users leasing individual workspaces. The proposal fails to provide any other scenario where the space could be physically divided, turning this into its stumbling stone. The zoning is clear but not always logical, as for example the lobby is placed in the vicinity of the quiet working area. The flexible conference and meeting rooms appeal to the jury.

Overall LOKO has a strong air of potential and an attractive and clear visual style which unfortunately turns repetitive and leaves an unfinished feel to its innovative ideas. The proposal would benefit from more tangible detailing to gain credibility and practicality.

6 RAAMI

RAAMI clears boldly away the existing structures to create a zone-inspired office environment filled with natural light. The composed use of TREY brand colours give spark and style to flash the new identity of the Student Union yet are applied smartly and scarcely to enable leasing out to other operators. The use of materials is well-thought and creates an attractive ensemble.

The proposal relies much on an open office solution and moving between the zones is planned skillfully avoiding disturbance to the other sectors. The transformable spaces on the semi-public zone on the eastern wall delighted the jury with their high multi-use quality. Although the proposal emphasizes collaboration and increases effective connectedness, it however has rather underestimated the physical space each individual might need for their work. This shows not only in the teamworking- but also in the quiet zone. The conference and meeting rooms work well in the first scenario but are left to semi-open spaces when the office is divided to other operators. The proposal's visioned scenarios do not completely convince the jury of their functionality. The reception in all of the scenarios was designed in the middle of an open space, consisting only of a desk which did not please the jury as a more solid structure with a small office and storage possibilities was looked for.

Overall RAAMI has a unified and aesthetically pleasing graphical presentation displaying clarity and variation of visual mediums in its layout. The entity and ideas unfortunately suffer from unpracticalities that complicate fluent office work.

7 3=1

3=1 a architecturally playful proposal, breathing industrial feel through its material and colour choices and thus hinting to the building's past in hosting small industry companies. The warmly-toned proposal relies heavily on furnishing solutions and recycling ideas of the existing office plan. The standardized cubicles on the southern wall have been demolished and replaced by an open-office and a multi-functional space. The liberal use of colours and varying style of office furniture create a lively but also slightly confusing effect.

The division and the different scenarios of the proposal have been carefully researched and exceedingly documented. The zoning is a strength of the proposal as it is well planned, functional and takes acoustics and sound blocking elements into account. The reception is visually attractive but lacks in functionality as it includes no solid office or storage option for the receptionist. The jury also was disappointed by the low quality, lack of adaptability and light of the conference room. The kitchens did not convince the jury.

Overall 3=1 offers a credible concept of an adaptable office space offering high quality in all of the various scenarios. The technical details are credible and give a professional feel. 3=1 however suffered from plentiful visuals and superfluous usage of furniture in them. The jury was overcome by a fuzzy overflowing finish and would have wished to see a more minimalistic version of the carrying idea.

8 High Five

High Five is a controlled and realistic proposal spiced with humour and brand colours of the Student Union. The floorplans follows in the footsteps of the existing plan, bringing it however to modern standards by clearing away unnecessary hallways and opening rooms to more natural light. What used to be standardized cubicles has been turned into an open office catering for a more collaborative, mobile and inclusive working culture.

The proposal has succeeded in creating clear and logical zoning, where visitors do not need to cross into the private zone although hallway area has been reduced. The reception is placed in the immediate vicinity of the entrance and includes working and storage space for the receptionist. The multi-use lobby together with the open kitchen shows potential for a welcoming TREY Café feeling but leaves little option for the employees to spend a non-disturbed and recharging lunch break. The other kitchen in the eastern corner of the office rather repeats the unpleasant darkness and planning flaws of the existing solution. The functionality of the rooms

placed in the middle of the office spaces also raise questions among the jury and the small, inflexible conference room is seen problematic. The general high quality of the first scenario does not reach to the other scenarios, and the jury battled to understand the thoughts spent on the division due to lack of visual input. The technical detailing of the proposal is throughout credible.

High Five presents a feasible and cost-effective proposal to make most of the existing structures in the office space. Although the work is solid and pleasing, it could profit from some braver architectural elements and ideas.

9 fluego

Fluego is a joyful and ambitious proposal that uses comparably many new walls to create some rhythm and life to the worn-out office space. Additional architectural innovation is provided in forms of a specially for the space designed reception pod and wooden hub-boxes on wheels.

The suggested entrance area is loose and light, perhaps even reaching to extravagance in space provided. The reception is clearly visible from the door and uses TREY colours to highlight the brand, and enables space for flyers and working within the kiosk. Acoustically the floor plan is limping as it enables the noise to carry out in the open office and extra noise might be created when the wheeled hubs are being pushed to other locations. The multi-use zone becomes adaptable by the movable elements but the hubs were considered to become an unnecessary and unwanted gimmick in the long run. Also the air circulation in the hubs is not presented although the air ventilation was otherwise planned in the proposal with care. The various scenarios were researched and presented with clear visuals and supportive text. However the division is only possible when new kitchen blocks are built and one of the operators must rely on the toilets in the public hallway.

In total Fluego displays a fresh and cheerful looking visual style with coherent and understandable graphical methods. Although much thought and detail had flown into the proposal, it did not respond to the tastes and criteria of the jury.

10 Muurit murtuu

Muurit murtuu is in contrast to its name a discreet and realistic proposal, clearing up the existing office structures and replanning some of its flawed parts. More of the natural light is guided into the inner areas by removing light blocking walls and placing glass in place of what used to be bricks. Working cubicles were merged into an open-office room and two new meeting rooms are now situated next to the windows on the southern wall. A round stage reminds of the old conference room walls and the space is now used as an open hot spot and seminar area.

The reception in Muurit murtuu is clear and well-planned with a side office appealing the jury. The kitchen however might cause disturbance to the working areas next to it and the proposal does not manage to significantly reduce the large area reserved for hallway. The division of the office space among operators is problematic as it would demand an additional building procedure to be carried out.

Although Muurit murtuu uses ageless materials cleverly to define zones and movement, in the end the jury wished the proposal to be a bit more daring and less retro. The dark colours and close similarities to the existing space did not fit the jury's taste and vision about the new life the TREY Offices are looking for.

11 VIREILLÄ

VIREILLÄ has a youthful and innovative touch in creating a modernized office environment with a variation of spaces both in function and atmosphere. The proposal focuses on creative and cooperative working, which is shown in the multifaceted communal areas and shared workplaces. The well-being and comfort of the employees is emphasized in providing room for relaxation and recreational activities, although the jury felt that some of the communal and recreational areas shared rather similar functions and hierarchy in the end.

The open plan solution was furnished additionally with a playful smallish huts to house diverse working styles or storage.

The open floorplan of VIREILLÄ aims to increase the future adaptability and connectedness of the office space. This solution works wonderfully in the first scenario in creating a public zone to the other and a focused-work zone to the other half of the office. The buffering room mass in the middle of the otherwise open office is a clever way to block noise from the louder functions. Yet the placing of the conference and meeting rooms behind the area for withdrawal seems to create illogical traffic through the quiet public zone. The reception in the first scenario divided the jury opinions as no closeable service office was provided yet the vicinity of the kitchen combined with the lobby and ideation area enables the Student Union to create a welcoming and attractive Café atmosphere to present their identity and brand values. The overall balance of the three scenarios presented in the proposal were rather limping. Although the kitchen and toilet solutions were centrally placed allowing easier adaptability, it is difficult to provide equally qualitative and functional office spaces to the different operators.

VIREILLÄ displays a coherent and highly aesthetic graphical presentation which is clear, understandable and interesting to the end. The many visual mediums compliment the fresh ideas and create an overall elegant and joyful look for the proposal.

12 RATA

RATA has a strong architectural grasp and a distinct main theme. The existing office structures are wiped away to make space for entirely new idea of what the future of office work could look like. The supportive spaces are arranged along a narrow corridor hidden behind the large Oodi-like steps in the middle of the space.

The zone division in the proposal is not feasible as nothing stops the visitors to explore into the private areas. The openness and acoustic problems of the floorplan become the proposals stumbling stone that is difficult to overcome with the methods presented in the plan. The centrally placed "Arena" unfortunately adds to the noise pollution that is spilling over to the concentration demanding work zone. The suggested working areas lean too heavily on the team working side, leaving other kinds of working spots less developed. The soft aesthetics of the interior and furnishing display a dynamic contrast to the rawness of the concrete.

Although the sculptural and innovative aspect of Rata makes it interesting for the jury, the functionality does not suit the Student Union's realistic needs nor does the proposal cater to the division scenarios.

3. PRIZES AND DIPLOMAS

The winners of the competition are awarded cash and/or book prizes and diplomas. The cash prizes are taxable income for their recipients and must be declared to tax authorities. The competition prizes are in total 3100 € as follows:

1. prize 1500 €	<u>HEMMA</u> Maria Väätäinen
2. prize 1000 €	<u>Kehys</u> Annika Tuominen
3. prize 500 €	<u>Vireillä</u> Mette Biström
Honorary mention, book prize, value 50 €	<u>High Five</u> Mathias Herbst
Honorary mention, book prize, value 50 €	<u>RAAMI</u> Kari Kytölä