



EUROPAN KOSOVO

Ilir Gjinolli president

Rron Tresi secretary

contact@europan-kosovo.org

www.europan-kosovo.org

www.europan-europe.eu

Rr.UÇK 50/1
10000 Prishtina,
Kosovo

EUROPAN 12

MINUTES OF JURY PROCESS

ADAPTABLE CITY

Gjilan, Kosovo

SECOND JURY ROUND OF EUROSPAN 12, SITE KOSOVO, GJILAN

LOCATION

The second jury round takes place in Pantin, France on the 10-11th of November (Sunday-Monday), 2013 at the Centre National de la Danse

The jury members participated in the presentation of each site introduced by an official, which was held one day before the final judging, explaining the site and design task that was part of Eurospan 12 edition.

The city of Gjilan was presented by Mr. Ilir Gjinolli where jury members were familiarized with site characteristics and design challenge.

PARTICIPANTS

Michelle PROVOOST Architectural Historian, Director of the International New Town Institute (INTI) in Almere, the Netherlands (NL) – head of the jury

Jurg DEGEN head of department of urban development, Basel (CH)

Elisabeth MERK head of department of urban development, Munich (DE)

Markus PERNTHALER Architect, Graz/Vienna (AT)

Christoph LUCHSINGER Architect, Professor at the TU Vienna, Luzern/Vienna (CH)

Henri BAVA Landscape Architect, AGENCE TER, Professor at the TU Karlsruhe, Paris/Karlsruhe (FR)

Marcel SMETS Architect, Professor at the KU Leuven/Belgium (BE)

Peter Istvan BALOGH Landscape Architect, Phd., Associate Professor at Corvinus University, Budapest (HU)

Lulzim KABASHI Architect, Zagreb (HR)

Bernd VLAY Architect, General Secretary of Eurospan Osterreich - non-voting member

Pia SPIESBERGER Architect, member of Eurospan Osterreich - non-voting member

Rron TRESI Architect, General Secretary of Eurospan Kosovo - non-voting member

SZABO Arpad Architect, national coordinator of Eurospan Magyarorszag – non-voting Member

The jury evaluates the projects of Eurospan Austria, Kosovo and Hungary namely the sites: Vienna - Kagran, Vienna – Siemensacker; Graz, Amstetten, Gjilan and Budapest.

In the morning the jury members were made familiar with the sites and projects by the different organisations of Europan (Austria, Kosovo, Hungary), and the representatives of the cities and clients.

The jury decides unanimously to nominate:

Michelle Provoost as president of the jury.

Marcel Smets as vice president of the jury.

The jury consists of 9 votes for all sites.

Bernd Vlay introduces the procedure of the jury. In general, there is one winning project and one runner-up prize on each site, but there is also the possibility to define no winner and nominate 3 runners-up. The winning projects should be chosen not for easy and fast implementation but as contributions to architectural and urbanist innovation which inspires and initiates a challenging and fruitful process of implementation. They should also enable the cities and clients to understand the potential of the sites and to imagine new and unconventional ways to deal with them. Moreover a Special Mention can be awarded to a project considered of being especially innovative yet without addressing sufficiently the brief and demands of the site. The authors of such proposals do not receive a financial reward, but will be published.

1st prize: 12.000€ runner up: 6.000€

The jury decides to first discuss the projects, then to make a further preselection and leave the final decision for the second jury day, afternoon of Monday 11th of Nov.

Preliminary remarks (Marcel Smets)

The jury agrees that there shall be a certain generosity in evaluating the projects, paying tribute to the specific framework of Europan.

At the same time the jury has to consider that Europan is a competition for young architects who are fully educated, judging the competition projects as a work of architects and not of students. The aim of Europan should be to give a clear sign to the city about the potential and the quality of the projects with the aim to figure out innovative projects which also can be implemented.

For this reason the jury will write recommendations which describe the qualities of the winning projects, including advises for the cities and clients about future implementation-steps.

After electing **Michelle Provoost** as president of jury, it was decided that projects to be discussed and go through voting, to select the possible winner project.

General comments:

Surpassing around the city contributes on the city development. Roads behind the center are narrow. It is dangerous to discuss just about traffic. The idea is to decrease the amount of traffic.

Michelle Provoost as head of the jury proposes to make project overview and then to continue with elimination.

VF243 - Crossroads

This project proposes to keep the main axis of the city but with several changes in traffic. One characteristic of this proposal is that the development of the city in future is based on these closed blocks that will grow around the main axis by creating fragmented space. The project is foreseen to be realized in phases.

Comments

How to transform through densifying? It is a big space for a small city. The strategy of the project is to densify the site.

NG280 – Gjilan local stories

This project proposes a new type of public space which includes a bigger structure that will serve for several functions. It will be placed in the crossing of two main axis of the town – river flow and the traffic axis.

This project also proposes to relocate the cultural center, which is also seen as very ambitious because land ownership is an issue that can trigger several questions.

It is a quite a unique proposal. The city center serves as a main structure. Traffic is based in public transportation and pedestrian only.

Comments:

Scale, articulation, it is not that bad for the city. You can go through with public transport. It is not a city that will grow. Bypass helps the traffic. Municipality doesn't want a main road passing through the city center.

XX634 – Welcome to urban wellness

This project gives a phasing proposal of city development. As other projects it is dealing with public space and 3 proposed buildings as need from the municipality.

Traffic is organized that public transport, bicycles and pedestrian movement to be allowed all the way through the axis while car traffic is diverted not to pass in the main square.

The axis is treated as one strip of functions where the main square embraces multifunctional activities of three proposed buildings. The public space is improved with green elements.

Comments:

This project is based on big volumes. Some details are not visible in the project.

AH665 – Good old times

This project is a bit different from the others since it is treating the space with smaller structures. What is specific about this project is that it is fragmenting the space by creating smaller public spaces. This is done by these small structures that have to be built around the intervention area. All the functions are spread along the axis. The main square is functioning with 3 types of building.

Comments:

There are quite small structures across the stripe.

Shrinking the space can be seen also as quality. It decreases the public space.

The project proposes traffic to be diverted.

There are elements that are not foreseen in the design brief.

This project uses existing morphology of the city.

According to the design, reconstruction of the city center is proposed.

MV819 – Dynamic urban platforms

This project is treating elements of the design brief by concentrating on the city center where main functions take place.

The design is based on big structures that somehow are changing the scale of the city.

Comments:

It proposes a tunnel within the whole center area.

It creates a sequence of public space. It is decreasing the public space.

Upscale socialism development.

ZF109 – Plug it Gjilan

Also this project is completing the design brief task by designing 3 buildings as requested.

Again big structures are emphasizing the city center and the space between is turned into pedestrian area with a lot of green space. As it concerns adaptability, this project is dealing mostly with the public space where according to season it changes from ice skating field in winter to green waterfront in summer. Also the square serves for shopping, different events and performances.

Comments:

Traffic is diverted so the cars go around the main square.

Drawings are not that comprehensive.

As it is proposed in the project, it is impossible to start with the hotel first.

Landscape is a bit difficult to be implemented as in the proposal.

After discussions about presented projects, head of the jury **Michelle Provoost** proposes to eliminate projects that have big structures and not organized traffic.

Voting takes place

NG280 – The design proposes usage of location that is not included within the project site, so the land ownership can be a big challenge.

Comment:

- Square is a bit problematic.

The plea is made to eliminate the project: yes/no: 8/1

MV819

The plea is made to eliminate the project: yes/no: 8/1

ZF109

The plea is made to eliminate the project: yes/no: 7/2

VF243

Comments:

- The project proposes big open space to see big buildings.
- Trying to create the big square and keep the axis. It doesn't work but it is ambitious.
- The idea is to put the river in the city center.
- To be careful, it changed the city structure and it looks smaller.
- It is inappropriate to put blocks in the city center. It is like colonizing the space.

The plea is made to eliminate the project: yes/no: 9/0

XX634

Comments: Two different concepts.

- Traffic must have a speed limit.
- The idea is to mix pedestrian, bike and public traffic and cars with slow speed.

***Since there are two projects brought to discussion, several arguments were discussed among jury members:**

AH665

Comments:

- It is hard to understand how to incorporate small structures. It is not a stripe but different zones.
- The traffic plan is not that suitable for the site because it is problematic do divert.
- The team is proposing the project to be through phasing and to divert traffic.
- There are some discussions about the distances.
- The idea is to make pedestrian space so cars cannot pass.
- The strategy of the municipality is to make this space for pedestrian use.

- This proposal has some issues that can be challenging.
- Is it the right solution? Go back to leaving the strip untouched.
- Is this proposal influenced from socialism typology?
- The scale in project (XX634) is under discussion.
- Strip remains in clear shape and direction. Somehow it privatizes the public (AH665).
- (XX634) has several issues that are under discussion.
- (AH665) is not that adaptable because it is formed from several structures, and for functioning well it has to be consisted from all proposed small structures.
- Very nostalgic view to city. City is wounded during socialism times. The city cannot change only by building few buildings.
- Buildings dependent on the size of public space. Fragmentation of space is what is proposed.
- The Municipality of Gjilan is requesting that there should be an open space.
- Dignified qualitative space. Is the square needed? You can make collective space.
- City has vernacular identity. The proposal is to mix, both the old and new. There is need for big plaza.
- This project (AH665) tells us to look in the past and it is possible to deal with scale. The existing situation of the city is taken into consideration.

- There is a need for qualitative programme.
- There is a need to enhance the quality of the stripe by adding functions.
- Recall what is needed. If linear structure functions, they would not need the new proposal.

- **XX364** raises the question if by building just 3 buildings and not dealing so much with the surrounding and the public space is a proposal that the city needs.
- **AH665**: is related to smaller structures that infill the space and have to be there so the whole area will function as one.
- **XX364**: Transform south part for pedestrian but keep the axis. Good solution because you cannot park.
- In this design the traffic can be regulated like other EU cities. It has to function within limited schedule.
- The question is what can be the new energy for the city.

- There is a discussion about the scale of buildings. There is a challenge to keep the public space with big scale buildings.
- It is modern town, keep what you have. Combine old and new.
- You have to consider problems, needs, traffic and identity. There is no direct relation to collective space and square.
- There are different needs for the traffic.
- Can the whole design of the area be impacted by traffic problems?
- City needs three buildings. AH665 is not a problem. The city will not develop the idea of the square.
- 3 buildings will have to be supported by proposed smaller structures.
- **XX634** Creates a landscape and linear flow of space.
- **AH665** is discussed among jury members if it is presenting acceptable solution.

VOTING

Since there were discussions of what is needed from the city, the tackled topic and design brief, jury members propose that in the case of Gjilan there will be one runner up project and one special mention.

- There should be a discussion on how does this decision help the city to solve problems.
- Two remaining projects have similar level of tackling the problem.
- **XX634** has some issues that cannot be accepted as a winning project.
- **AH665** has solutions that are acceptable for the city.
- **AH665** The project presents fragmented street of neoliberal development.
- **XX634** is possible because the city center is transformed.

After long discussions about prizes for Gjilan site, and after all arguments were brought to table, there was a voting about prizes.

ALL IN FAVOR – There is no first prize.

Rron Tresi, secretary of European Kosovo, explains the importance to give a clear and strong sign to the city. In case of one runner up-project the municipality needs to know clearly about the reasons to decide for a runner up, getting the information about the strong and the weak points of the project, and how to approach its potential in the follow-up procedure. The jury underline that the lack of a first prize demonstrates the necessity of reconsidering carefully the qualities of the nominated runner up project. European Austria offers to support European Kosovo in the implementation process.

Special mentions

A special mention has to be an innovative project showing an exceptional approach which has not to be linked to the local site conditions at any prize, but must give an interesting impulse for the discussion on contemporary urbanistic and architectural discourse.

Runner up prize:

AH665 – Gets three votes for runner up prize.

The plea is made to nominate the project as runner up: yes/no: 3/6

XX634 – Gets six votes for runner up prize.

The plea is made to nominate the project as runner up: yes/no: 6/3

XX634 Welcome to urban wellness – Runner up prize – Gijlan

Since the debate was done upon two last proposals and the project AH665 was with the biggest number of comments and also it presents a different approach for the design, something that is not seen in other proposals, for the sake of productive discussion, it is decided that this project to get the Special Mention prize.

AH665 Good old times – Special mention – Gijlan

XX634 – Runner up prize is awarded to:

AUTHORS

- **JUAN MARCOS RODRIGUEZ DIAZ (ES), ARCHITECT**
- **CONXA GENE GARCIA (ES), ARCHITECT**
- **CARMEN LARGACHA POLO (ES), ARCHITECT**
- **JOAN ALOMAR MATEU (ES), ARCHITECT**
- **JAVIER IÑIGO MORENO-VENTAS (ES), ARCHITECT**
- **IÑAKI LLORENS CANOSA (ES), ARCHITECT**

AH665 – Special mention prize is awarded to:

AUTHORS

- **CRISTINA CORDERO MORA (ES), ARCHITECT**
- **FERRAN VILADOMAT SERRAT (ES), BUILDING ENGINEER**

COLLABORATORS

- **ARNAU SAÑE RIERA (ES), STUDENT IN ARCHITECTURE**
- **ENRIC DE LA HOYA NOLLA (ES), STUDENT IN ARCHITECTURE**

Recommendations:

- > *The European runner up team shall be involved in the future process.*
- > *The architecture of the three buildings should be developed in three architectural competitions, resulting in an implementation by different architects.*
- > *The dimension of the three buildings has to be revised.*
- > *The three buildings must contribute much stronger to the quality of the public space, being linked more convincingly to the square.*

- > *The idea of the landscaped central space should be reconsidered in its character (landscaped square, strongly addressing its usability).*
- > *The whole central area must be seen as a space which has to remain a shared space, including the whole main road as a longitudinal urban public space.*
- > *The design of the river has to be included in in a better way.*
- > *An internationally experienced person/team on the development of public space shall be involved*



Michelle Provoost

Head of the Jury

Minutes of the meeting

First round of Jury meeting

Location: Theater Building / Gallery, Gjilan, Kosovo

Date: 07.09.2013

Pre session discussion

- What does Municipality of Gjilan expect from European 12.

Diversity in proposals for:

- Traffic, intersections.
- Cultural center
- Municipality building
- Is there any strategy? If yes, what is the strategy?
- Markus: Is the strategy that the ring to be penetrated or there is an option for stoppage of radial roads.
- It can be penetrated but with some restrictions. Inner roads of the ring must have a lower level of traffic.
- This option is more suitable with the current situation.
- Is the city's intention to be focused more in the center?
- Does the city need to be poly centric? Or is one center sufficient?
- The theme of adaptability has to be followed all over the city.
- For the moment the city has one main center.
- Which is the center's potential? Does it need to be bigger or just to be considered as a big potential?
- The fact that the land is owned by the municipality, all public services are positioned in the center.
- Which is the main reason for tourism in Gjilan?
- Is it business?
- Or culture?
- Gjilan has very good geographical position. It is near the border with other countries that are inhabited with Albanians.

Inauguration of the jury

In the name of European Europe and European Austria, Bernd Vlay (secretary of European Austria) made the opening speech for jury session.

It is decided that 7 people have to take part in evaluation and have the right on vote.

Markus Pernthaler is selected as the chairman of jury and he will guide and be the moderator of evaluation process.

Members of the jury:

- Markus Pernthaler (Graz) – Architect, Head of Jury
- Bernd Vlay (Vienna) – Architect, Secretary of European Austria
- Lulzim Kabashi (Zagreb) – Architect, member of Jury
- Naim Korqa (Gjilan) - Architect
- Fadil Sherifi (Municipality of Gjilan) – Planning officer
- Eliza Hoxha (Prishtina) – Architect, member of European Kosovo board
- Bahrije Mahmuti (Municipality of Gjilan) – Director of urbanism

European Secretariat:

- Ilir Gjinolli (President of European Kosovo) - Architect
- Rron Tresi (General Secretary of European Kosovo) - Architect
-

Aim: 15-20% of all submissions will be selected to proceed with the second jury meeting in Paris.

Evaluation criteria:

- Conceptual content
- Degree of innovation - Adaptable city
- Strategy of the project

The results will be sent to Paris for further evaluation and discussion.

1st Round:

This round is more as observation of projects, followed by short description and discussion between jury members. This round has positive aspect and submissions are voted for further steps.

For one submission to go to other level only 2 votes are needed.

Any one from the jury can recall a work that has been eliminated.

DD440

- Interesting design, using existing traffic.
- Making it visible but not primary. Clear differentiation of functions; continuity of greenery.
- Some elements are not that clear.

- Used existing space to put different buildings.
- New buildings in public space.

PJ572

- Topography is important. Intersections. Sunken square.
- This proposal kept the city scale. It preserves the green space.
- Issue of mobility is very important.
- The functions have to be preserved.

SD763

- This project is difficult to be implemented in one phase.
- Quite huge public space. Eliminated traffic. Bus can go through the center.
- This proposal used current elements from the city.
- Transportation points have to be presented.
- The public space is enhanced.
- This proposal is bringing also something new.

YX820

- Abstract proposal. Green path creates the city, green platforms.
- This proposal is making micro squares. It is fragmenting in smaller scale.
- Explanation of axis is absent. The space is isolated.
- Building have motif on the façade that is related to the tradition.

BA908

- Similar approach for the project as previous European edition in Peja.
- The project is explained as a process of renewal of society through architecture.
- This proposal is implying social model.
- The structure is autonomous. It is not adaptable to the city.
- In the other hand, it can attract people from around.
- This proposal has more theoretical approach.
- It is presented as a mega structure that contains all the functions requested for the city center.

PH145

- It is different approach. It is presented as landscape architecture. It doesn't focus on buildings. It deals only with green space.
- Linear public space. It makes the traffic less present.
- Intervention with small structures. Downscaling buildings.

- This proposal is bringing the mentality of Green Urban Areas.

LV295

- Works with the line, idea of cross sections, and creation of rhythm with cultural center.
- It presents outdoor landscape and public square.
- There is a big entrance to underground parking.
- It is vertical architecture.
- There is a connection with the river.
- Differentiation of lines is very clear.
- Public furniture is present.

LG800

- This proposal has ramps for cars and the pedestrian area is quiet. It keeps the traffic in both parts. The concentration is at the square.

AH665

- There is no traffic. It doesn't exist underground or above the ground.
- It is preserving the existing line.
- It is reacting to existing fabric.
- Classic way of the square.
- This proposal presents four public spaces with different qualities.
- Each building is part of the same fabric.
- It is using a secondary road.
- There is no clear connection. The space is partitioned.

IX258

- In this proposal there are six topics. The traffic is put underground.
- The center is defined by buildings.

ZH775

- Keeps traffic organization focused in center buildings.
- In this project greenery is present.
- It keeps modernist concept
- How does the city see this modern architecture?

WQ505

- The traffic is put underground.
- The concept is based on patterns. Buildings are becoming part of patterns.
- The public space has a ramp in the center.

- The public space is presented as continuous shared carpet.

XN394

- It is a proposal that is considered as out of space.
- The team has proposed a very adventurous project.
- The project creates a new identity.
- There might be lack of treatment for the city as a whole.

VF243

- Clean concept. Clean definition. Axis creation.
- It is transforming the city and you can read the blocks.
- Urbanism from 19th century creating new blocks with existing fabric.
- In this proposal there is a tendency to differentiate buildings.
- The idea is to make the city more compact.
- Combination of ottoman structures and European structures.
- Alternatives have to be discussed.

IR777

- Reference is made from the book "Learning from Las Vegas".
- This proposal is creating a strip. The value of the strip is maximized. The strip is hyperactive.
- It is not inclusive for the back side of the urban area.
- Traffic is not an issue. It is creating identity of the city.
- Is there any problem to create high rise?
- Clear limit if the city texture. Hyperactive new center.

GQ223

- In this proposal the texture on the ground is commented among all.
- The surface is unifying all space. Idea of the pattern. Smart carpet for different activities. Public space is presented as shared space.

XX634

- Re-routing concept. 3 strong buildings. Creating identity.
- Preserving public space.
- There is a possible extension.
- This project has 3 different building types. Clean concept.

XV606

- Related to existing conditions of settlements.

- This project is reducing public space.
- Small squares in inner city.
- Different quality of public space.

ZF109

- This project is presented with center space and greenery. There is also a difference in scale.
- The landscape is created in larger scale.

MV819

- This project has a simple public space.
- Preserved the green, the traffic is diverted.
- Same existing character but with improvements.

TL677

- It is keeping the traffic but with different texture.

VY962

- How to link to the surrounding.
- This proposal kept the traffic.
- The presentation is very interesting.

TZ496

(No comments)

SS079

- The whole project is presented as a mega structure. The methodology of the work is interesting.

NG280

- It is a link that connects both sides of the square.

BQ018

- Center activities. Green space is preserved. Traffic is redirected.

GG084

- There is an intervention in the axis. The green space is destroyed.

EN015

- Dividing the parts.

EA691

- Creation of one square with topography with central position.

QJ939

(No comments but left for further discussion)

OK764

- Ramps are problematic because of the river.

RE550

- The traffic is preserved. There is a connection between the mosque and the cultural center.
- The straight road is a bit problematic for speeding.

BJ255

- River as important element, the road is untouched, different spaces, plenty of green space, fragmented.
- Not understandable. The square is in lower level.

EB277

- Connection between landscape and buildings.
- This project has adaptable traffic.

OI635

- Larger consideration of the ring.
- Public space on the edge is using roofs as public space.

2nd Round (16:00)

Criteria:

- Projects without green space are not suitable.
- Projects that propose usage of ramps for traffic and access are not suitable.

***This round is based on voting and some comments were given to each project:**

1. **DD440 – 0 votes – Bridge is not suitable.**
2. **PJ572 – 2 votes – Huge barrier**
3. **SD763 – 0 votes – The tunnel is too long, too many levels, not so much space for adaptation. It is described as museum of territories.**
4. **YX820 – 0 votes – Poor presentation**
5. **BA908 – 2 votes**
6. **PH145 – 0 votes – it is one dimensional. It doesn't meet the needs of the city.**
7. **LV295 – 2 votes – Attractive bridging, creating lot of patterns, clean boulevard, scale of the city is misunderstood.**
8. **LG800 – 0 votes**
9. **AH665 – 5 votes**
10. **IX258 – 0 votes**
11. **ZH775 – 0 votes**
12. **WQ505 – 0 votes**
13. **XN394 – 0 votes**
14. **VF243 – 4 votes**
15. **IR777 – 0 votes – Problematic green space and ramps.**
16. **GQ223 – 0 votes**
17. **XX634 – 6 votes**
18. **XV606 – 0 votes**
19. **ZF109 – 3 votes – Undefined landscape**
20. **MV819 – 6 votes**
21. **TL677 – 0 votes**
22. **VY962 – 0 votes**
23. **TZ496 – 0 votes**
24. **SS079 – 0 votes**
25. **NG280 – 5 votes**
26. **BQ018 – 0 votes – relation is not appropriate**
27. **GG084 – 2 votes**
28. **EN015 – 0 votes**
29. **EA691 – 0 votes**
30. **QJ939 – 2 votes – too formalistic**
31. **OK764 – 0 votes**
32. **RE550 – 0 votes – Inner court is problematic**
33. **BJ255 – 4 votes – problematic culture center**

34. EB277 – 0 votes

35. OI635 – 0 votes

3rd Round (17:00)

AH665

City: Infrastructure is not analyzed, traffic also. The architecture is outdated, ground covering proposal is not suitable.

LV295

City: It is very difficult and not necessary to change the traffic lane from the existing to another one which is parallel.

It is also possible to change the traffic to lower density.

Discussions about two proposals:

AH665

- *Good qualities, flexible, scale fits on the structure.*
- *The huge space is divided into smaller parts.*
- *This project is easy to modify.*
- *Small scale structure added. Possible square in the south part.*
- *It is becoming part of the old structure.*
- *Architecture is changeable.*
- *Programme is good. Good organizing.*
- *Good space to rest.*
- *Good example of traffic mixture.*

LV295

- *There is a change of green strip. It is not necessary.*
- *Horizontal connection is not analyzed enough.*

BA908

- *It is considered as acupuncture in the city.*
- *It is based on social engineering methodology.*
- *It represents a frozen status quo.*
- *It is transformation in social aspect.*

City: It has good qualities because it contains functions that were requested.

Individuality has to be respected. It doesn't function in the city.

PJ572

- *It is suitable to the existing situation.*
- *It doesn't have enough analysis in urban matter.*

- Urban blocks have lack of analysis.
- Traffic is not treated in desired level.
- It is not a solution that the city is asking for.

BJ255

- It is a utopic proposal.
- It is very hard to be built because of underground levels.

QJ939

- The city center is preserved.
- New structures are proposed.
- The square is formed from 3 structures.
- The traffic is proposed to be in low density.
- Everything is in the same level and it is not clear enough.

GG084

- In this project green space is reduced.
- It is not connected to new developments.

NG280

- Too many functions concentrated in one place.
- It is a possible option.
- Accessibility fulfills the need.
- Traffic is a bit problematic.
- Public transport is sufficient.

MV819

- Labyrinths are not that suitable.
- The island is not necessary.
- It is interesting concept.
- The traffic should be re considered.
- Public transport to go through the main square is optional.

ZF109

- Traffic is good but with some changes.
- Municipality building is displaced.
- Public space has good quality.

XX634

- It has similar concept with another submission.

VF243

- It has similar traffic concept.
- Secondary roads are well defined.
- It is good concept.

*3rd Round is voted as following:

Majority has to decide, 4 votes needed to pass to final round.

AH665 – all in favor

LV295 – 1 vote

BA908 – 3 votes

PJ572 – 0 votes

BJ255 – 3 votes

QJ929 – all in favor

GG084 – 2 votes

NG280 – all in favor

MV819 – all in favor

ZF109 – all in favor

XX634 – all in favor

VF243 – all in favor

FINAL ROUND (19:00)

QJ939 IS BROUGHT TO DISCUSSION:

City: Buildings are too big but the square is acceptable.

- Agrees on the scale of the buildings that are not suitable and also the square is not well organized.
- The theater building is somehow hidden from the new structures proposed. It doesn't connect with the center. It is not related to the urban space.
- Good graphics but not presenting the idea so convincing.

ZF109 IS BROUGHT TO DISCUSSION:

- Do we need to keep this submission in the competition for further rounds?

City: Projects can be adjusted to meet requirements of the city and this one needs small adjustments. In this submission the green space has to be bigger.

- We are talking about urban center. In this case the center is not defined well.
- How does the city see the center?
- It looks more like scenery outside of the city.

City: River can dry out in the summer and it doesn't have enough water. The landscape proposed is not that possible in the center.

- The proposal is a bit suspicious.

The jury decides all in favor to vote for 6 submissions to go further in the competition:

- 1. AH665 – Good old times**
- 2. NG280 – Gjilan local stories**
- 3. MV819 – Dynamic urban platforms**
- 4. ZF109 – Plug it Gjilan**
- 5. XX634 – Welcome to urban wellness**
- 6. VF243 - Crossroads**

List of project submitted (**Code and name of the project**)

- VF243 - CROSSROADS - PRESELECTION
- XX634 - WELCOME TO URBAN WELLNESS! - PRESELECTION
- MV819 - DYNAMIC URBAN PLATFORMS - PRESELECTION
- ZF109 - PLUG IT GJILAN - PRESELECTION
- NG280 - LOCAL STORIES - PRESELECTION
- AH665 - GOOD OLD TIMES. - PRESELECTION
- BJ255 - RIVERBANK -
- OI635 - THE S CITY -
- VY962 - WELCOME TO FABULOUS GJILAN -
- SD763 - GROUND OF POSSIBILITIES -
- IR777 - _BUBBLES FRAME! -
- LV295 - CULTURAL INTERSECTION -
- LG800 - NEXUS -
- BA908 - STRUCTURE -
- BQ018 - MERGING PLATFORMS -
- ZH775 - PLACE CARREE -
- EA691 - G2 - G SQUARE -
- PH145 - THE FERTILE VALLEY -
- XV606 - THE BOULEVARD A SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE -
- IX258 - WATERHALL -
- YX820 - THE GREEN PATH -
- RE550 - SERENDIPITY OF THE STRIP -
- XN394 - THE TREE OF LIFE -
- EN015 - UNFOLDING GJILAN'S HIDDEN POTENTIALS -
- TL677 - A COMMON GROUND FOR GJILAN -
- SS079 - PALLATI KENAQESI -
- GG084 - JUST, TAKE IT! -
- EB277 - ELASTICITY -
- QJ939 - THE HEART -
- WQ505 - PATTERN SCENES IN GJILAN -
- OK764 - DIGGING FOR IDENTITIES -
- GQ223 - CARPTDIEM -
- TZ496 - MAGNET -
- PJ572 - SOUS LES PAVÉS, LA PLAGE -
- DD440 - GIVEBACK MIRUSHA -