

The online pre-elimination of MimED / Arch ED 2018 took place in between November 04 – 19, 2018. Among 662 projects accepted to the competition 257 projects have succeeded on the pre-elimination.

The jury of MimED 2018 was held on 08 December 2018 at İTÜ Taşkışla Campus 203 corridor at 09.30 with the participation of Tonguç AKIŞ [assoc.prof.dr, iyte / metu], Fatmagül ASLANER GEGEOĞLU [dr. metu / itu / georgia university, fatmagül aslaner gegeoğlu mimarlık], Zeynep ATAŞ [assist.prof.dr, mardin artuklu university / itu], Burçin GÜNGEN [dr., itu], Meltem GÜREL [prof.dr., yaşar university / uni. of illinois urbana-champaign], Kürşad ÖZDEMİR [assist.prof.dr., mef / mimar sinan university of fine arts / tu wien], Uta POTTGIESSER [prof.dr, university of antwerp, belgium], Javier Sánchez MERINA [prof.dr., alicante university, spain] and Özcan UYGUR m.arch., metu, uygur mimarlık].

Coordinator Meltem BASLO [dr., itu] and the reporters Aybike BATUK [res.assist., kadir has university], Emre GÖKDEL [res.assist., istanbul ticaret university], Çağdaş KAYA [res.assist., itu] and Gamze OKUMUŞ [res.assist., mimar sinan university of fine arts] informed the jury that in total 257 projects have succeeded on the online pre-elimination with the following distribution:

1st year category 43 projects,

2nd year category 71 projects,

3rd year category 90 projects,

4th year category 49 projects. Four projects have not been submitted printed to the competition; so 253 projects are evaluated by the jury.

Firstly, the jury reached consensus on the priority criteria for consideration of the evaluation of the projects. These criteria are

- Conceptualization
- Response to context
- Spatial articulation
- Representation
- The development of the project

Jury has evaluated first year projects together. For other categories the jury process was to examine the projects individually then to proceed to collective evaluation. The first day evaluations lasted until 20.00.

The jury met again on Sunday, December 09, 2018 at 09.30 and collectively decided on the award groups. The awarded projects are determined at the end of two or three tours of voting.

1st Year Category

On the online pre-elimination projects with the code number M2018-10036, M2018-10050, M2018-10129, M2018-10238, M2018-10278, M2018-10327, M2018-10561, M2018-10812, M2018-10870, M2018-11164, M2018-11396, M2018-11494, M2018-11631, M2018-11632, M2018-11890, M2018-11899, M2018-11902, M2018-12053, M2018-12088, M2018-12183, M2018-12398, M2018-12516, M2018-12661, M2018-12915, M2018-12994, M2018-13155, M2018-13256, M2018-13405, M2018-13641, M2018-13647, M2018-13718, M2018-13748, M2018-13792, M2018-13864, M2018-14077, M2018-14133, M2018-14365, M2018-14614, M2018-14717, M2018-14839, M2018-14865, M2018-14873, M2018-14980, M2018-15123, M2018-15287, M2018-15289, M2018-15417, M2018-15429, M2018-15683, M2018-15685, M2018-15782, M2018-15893, M2018-15931, M2018-16054, M2018-16133, M2018-16206, M2018-16336, M2018-16389, M2018-16401, M2018-16509, M2018-16658, M2018-16691, M2018-16834, M2018-16922, M2018-17061, M2018-17580, M2018-17897, M2018-17909, M2018-17924, M2018-18146, M2018-18178, M2018-18194, M2018-18258, M2018-18263, M2018-18418, M2018-18599, M2018-18688, M2018-18724, M2018-18827, M2018-19004, M2018-19168, M2018-19430, M2018-19440, M2018-19448, M2018-19581, M2018-19634, M2018-19694, M2018-19826, M2018-19856, M2018-19869 and M2018-19905 were eliminated [91 projects].

On the first round projects numbered 1001, 1007, 1009, 1011, 1016, 1017, 1022, 1025, 1026, 1031, 1033, 1034, 1035 and 1039 were eliminated because they did not meet at least three of the five criteria determined by the jury which are conceptualization, response to context, spatial articulation, representation and the development of the project [14 projects].

1001 Although it is positive that various visualization techniques were used, the development phases cannot be read from the project. The metaphoric sketch strengthens the statement, but the structure is not clearly defined. The project was eliminated unanimously.

1007 Despite the positive relation to the context and topography, it was eliminated by the majority vote due to the fragmented representation and lack of the expression of spatialization.

1009 The project is quite expressive and strong, but the aggressive method of representation and the missing relation between the plan and context weakens the project. It was eliminated by the majority vote.

1011 The project was found positive in its approach of analyzing the reference successfully, but the representation is conventional and the conceptualization is not mature enough. Therefore the project was eliminated unanimously.

1016 Although the use of the variable tools to examine the project is positive, the integration of Tarkovsky and Mondrian in terms of landscape and building is not clearly expressed. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1017 The graphical quality of the project was found favorable, however it does not question the context-content-form relations enough. Thus the development process of the project and ideas cannot be read. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1022 The urban agriculture theme was found positive, and the calculations of the spatial dimensions, circulation, were thought through, but the relationship between form and the surroundings of the project was not fitting. The project was eliminated unanimously.

1025 The project had ideas that had potential. However, there is not enough evidence on the life that is being promoted by the project, although the aspects are verbally mentioned. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1026 The project had sensitive concerns. However, it does not relate to its own concept and content. Also three dimensional composition does not give enough information about the spatiality of the project. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1031 The thought and analysis of the theme around flora shows potential. It is verbally mentioned that this is a temporary project but does not represent itself as such. Also, the relationship with the site is not worked through successfully. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1033 The project shows potential. However, the technical and graphical representation of the project was not matured. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1034 The originality and consistency of the project is positive. But the representation is not coherent and the spatialization cannot be understood. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1035 There are certain positive concerns regarding the spatiality of the project. However, the active and lively context of the project area cannot be read, and the relationship of the project with the context seems misrepresented. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1039 The wrong translation of the text was misleading about the motives of the project. The perspective images were high in numbers but technical and spatial aspects of the project cannot be read. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

On the second round projects numbered 1002, 1003, 1004, 1012, 1013, 1014,1015, 1019, 1024, 1028, 1029, 1037 and 1038 were eliminated [13 projects].

The jury report on the eliminated projects on the 2nd round

1002 The poetic character of the project is positive. The relationship of nature and tectonics in the total language of the project has a strong potential but it stays too generic. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1003 The project has commendable representation skills and its relationship with the landscape is found positive. But the way the project deals with the complexity is found problematic. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1004 The concept of social approach in a specific area is found positive, but the outcome was too conventional for an approach that promised much more potential. The project was eliminated unanimously.

1012 The project deals with archeology and it is an elaborated approach. The graphic representations were matured and coherent. However, the project outcome ended up as just a shelter, which had to have more relationship with its initiating ideas.

1013 Studying the idea of the city, and thinking of the relationship between vegetation and the building is positive. But this complexity does not reflect to the plans, and the project is not thoroughly elaborated in terms of what the project aims to connect.

1014 The graphical experiments on the initial phase of the project is found positive. However, the relation to site, context, and topography is found not matured enough. The project was eliminated unanimously.

1015 The multitude and consistency of representation was found positive, however the project has a confusion. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1019 Although the integration with the context was found positive, the project cannot manage to indicate that relation in representations. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1024 Although the approach of infusing the ground was found positive in terms of relating with the site; conceptualization and the relationship between function and site were found problematic. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1028 Although the relationship with the environment and the inspiration are found remarkable, the spatial quality was found not adequate. The project was eliminated unanimously.

1029 Although the study of light was positive, the jury found the project in terms of conceptualization mediocre and spatially poor. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1037 The diagrammatic representation of the project was found very strong, however, the scale of the project was found problematic. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1038 The comments of the jury on the light study and concept were positive, but the technical aspects of the project were found underdeveloped. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

On the third round projects numbered 1005, 1010, 1023, 1030, 1036, 1041 and 1042 were eliminated [7 projects].

The jury report on the eliminated projects on the 3rd round

1005 Although the conceptualization of the project was promising, the spatial quality was found underdeveloped. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1010 Although the compatible mixture of the concepts of the project were found positive, the project suffers from the lack of spatial indications. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1023 The relationship of the project to the context is commendable, but the presentation was too fragmented and to see the project as a whole was not possible. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1030 The execution and the visual techniques of the project had potential but it is found very hard to read the flow between representations. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1036 The project very clearly defines itself and its motives, however this could not be read from the representations within the project because of its fragmentation. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1041 The potential that the project experiments with the topography is found positive, however, the representation of the project is found not adequate. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

1042 Although it is found that the project had potential, it is also thought that it could have been executed better, regarding the analyses and representations. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

Remaining 7 projects were decided to form the award group. Accordingly project numbered 1021 and coded M2018-11453 was awarded with the SUCCESS AWARD; the project numbered 1018 and coded M2018-17886 was awarded with ENCOURAGEMENT AWARD, the project numbered 1008 and coded M2018-18874, the project numbered 1020 and coded M2018-19031, the project numbered 1027 and coded M2018-11868, the project numbered 1032 and coded M2018-16374, the project numbered 1040 and coded M2018-19997 were awarded with the JURY SPECIAL AWARD.

The jury report on the awarded projects

1021 | M2018-11453 SUCCESS AWARD

It is an honor for the jury to select this project as the first price, due to its strong response to topography and nature. It has been valued as a productive teamwork as part of the education of the contemporary architect. As well as the process followed of learning by doing. The selection of materials and elaboration through forms shows us the maturity of the authors in bringing their experience of life to university. The project was awarded with the success price with the majority of the votes.

1018 | M2018-17886 ENCOURAGEMENT AWARD

The jury values how the student finds opportunities of making architecture in the gaps of the city. By relating the activities to space, the project shows a maturity very valuable for the first year, as well as presenting a spatial organization and formalization. The project was awarded with the encouragement price with the majority of the votes.

1008 | M2018-18874 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

“The city as a cinematographic machine” presents a sophisticated articulation of different disciplines of art and architecture. The rich research of the three dimensional character is valued. The project was awarded with the jury special price with the majority of the votes.

1020 | M2018-19031 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The project “Free Sound” proposes the possibilities of a superstructure as a tool to produce a rich urban planning in human scale. The project was awarded with the jury special price with the majority of the votes.

1027 | M2018-11868 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

It is an emotional moment to realize how this student incorporates the ecological infrastructure from the beginning in a project, to propose a radical architecture that deals with the contemporary problems of energy and water consumption. The project was awarded with the jury special price with the majority of the votes.

1032 | M2018-16374 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The jury values enormously the introduction of a contemporary program to give a new life to a particular ruin. A delicate structure is generated by the movement of the user, and careful selection of materials. The project was awarded with the jury special price with the majority of the votes.

1040 | M2018-19997 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

“Narrative Path” manages to build the poetic of light within a clear structure, proposing new qualitative ways of looking at the world. The project was awarded with the jury special price with the majority of the votes.

2nd Year Category

On the online pre-elimination projects with the code number M2018-20147, M2018-20164, M2018-20279, M2018-20440, M2018-20519, M2018-20550, M2018-20691, M2018-20926, M2018-20943, M2018-20950, M2018-21129, M2018-21342, M2018-21444, M2018-21480, M2018-21517, M2018-21577, M2018-21598, M2018-21726, M2018-21761, M2018-22014, M2018-22153, M2018-22178, M2018-22297, M2018-22342, M2018-22350, M2018-22423, M2018-22461, M2018-22584, M2018-22742, M2018-22878, M2018-23038, M2018-23106, M2018-23160, M2018-23372, M2018-23481, M2018-23495, M2018-23528, M2018-23562, M2018-23573, M2018-23610, M2018-23819, M2018-23837, M2018-23963, M2018-24070, M2018-24115, M2018-24348, M2018-24460, M2018-24463, M2018-24479, M2018-24611, M2018-24618, M2018-24630, M2018-25087, M2018-25117, M2018-25154, M2018-25233, M2018-25258, M2018-25425, M2018-25453, M2018-26167, M2018-26211, M2018-26271, M2018-26326, M2018-26590, M2018-26838, M2018-26839, M2018-26841, M2018-26848, M2018-26886, M2018-27079, M2018-27262, M2018-27294, M2018-27382, M2018-27666, M2018-27703, M2018-27839, M2018-27915, M2018-28051, M2018-28175, M2018-28241, M2018-28289, M2018-28382, M2018-28427, M2018-28506, M2018-28567, M2018-28638, M2018-28701, M2018-28930, M2018-29056, M2018-29157, M2018-29235, M2018-29272, M2018-29313, M2018-29359, M2018-29584, M2018-29908, M2018-29959 and M2018-29960 were eliminated [98 projects].

On the first round projects 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2019, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2029, 2031, 2032, 2034, 2036, 2037, 2042, 2044, 2045, 2048, 2051, 2052, 2054, 2057, 2060, 2063, 2064, 2069, and 2071 were eliminated because they did not meet at least three of the five criteria determined by the jury which are conceptualization, response to context, spatial articulation, representation and the development of the project [37 projects].

On the second round projects numbered 2018, 2024, 2033, 2038, 2039, 2046, 2049, 2053, 2055, 2056, 2061, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068 and 2070 were eliminated [16 projects].

The jury report on the eliminated projects on the 2nd round

2018 The overall presentation of the project is commendable. However the project lacks certain aspects regarding its three dimensionality. Also it does not show much material and effort about its own main topic. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2024 The project had a provocative idea. However the motives of the project and its execution are not clearly stated and shown. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2033 The project had a powerful idea and the representation through the plans were commendable. However it did not develop further in terms of spatial organization. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2038 The presentation skills shown in the project is commendable, yet the spatial organization seems arbitrary and struggles to give a sense of space. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2039 The intention of trying to adapt open spaces within a project done in a very dense area is found as a positive motive. However, the project lacks a certain connection with its own concept and context. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2046 The project had potential, and the presentation is remarkable, whereas it lacked connection with its context. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2049 The project shows potential, but more analyses were needed throughout the process and the presentation makes it hard to see the motives of the project clearly. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2053 The project had potential whereas it is too hard to read because of the lack of clarity in its representation techniques. Also the conceptual and contextual relations were not thoroughly studied. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2055 The representation and level of articulation of the project, as well as the use of different potentials of various spatial tools showed promise. However, the project could have been developed better in terms of both spatiality and spatial organization. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2056 The idea of the project had potential but it was not thoroughly developed. Also there is a lack of relevance between structure and context, as well as the contributions of the structure itself within this context. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2061 The project showed potential yet it lacked connection with the context, regarding the open and semi open areas. Also the concept was not emphasized enough throughout the spatial development. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2065 The idea of the project was elaborated thoroughly, and it was found an idea that had potential in a historical context. However, how the life unfolds within the project needed more work and effort. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2066 The idea of the project, as well as the variation of spaces, showed potential. Although regarding its different users, how the life unfolds within the project could not be read. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2067 The project had developed a coherent system and articulated it. Although it was unclear about how the spaces, the units, work, as well as the quality of these spaces. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2068 The project had potential, but it did not have much relation to its context. Also, regarding the scale of the project, more detailed material needed to be presented. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2070 The project had a concept that has potential, but its relations with the context were not developed. Also the scale difference between architectural representations and images were misleading about the scale of certain aspects of the project. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

On the third round projects numbered 2005, 2014, 2017, 2020, 2028, 2030, 2043 and 2058 were eliminated [8 projects].

The jury report on the eliminated projects on the 3rd round

2005 The project had an idea that had potential, but it had issues about its scale and relations with its context, and the existing elements. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2014 The idea of the project, and the combination of its users, showed potential. The relation to topography was sufficiently worked. But the articulation of spaces were found too conventional, thus conflicting, for its own concept. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2017 The project had a systematic approach towards the articulation of masses, and its effort to relate to the environment is found positive. However, in terms of variation, the small sections were showing the alternatives, but these variations cannot be read through whole form. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2020 The representations and the idea of the project, as well as the systematic approach to it, had potential, but it was not clearly defined. The sections and plans were not enough to explain how all these elements come together. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2028 The representation skills demonstrated in the project were commendable. Although the concept of the project contradicts with its potential users, in terms of practical use of space and accessibility. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2030 The project showed an effort in representing the project, which was commendable. Also the concept of the project showed promise. However, the representation and the idea of the society that was promoted by the project needed to be further articulated. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2043 The idea of co-working shows potential within the context of an art studio. Although, if there were novel ideas regarding new ways of collaboration, it should have been reflected in the architecture as well. Thus, the methods and plans were found too conventional for such an endeavor. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

2058 The studies throughout the project and the idea of collective use of space were found commendable. Although, these cannot be read clearly through the representations provided. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

Remaining 10 projects were decided to form the award group. Accordingly project numbered 2012 and coded M2018-27584 with the project numbered 2040 and coded M2018-24764 were awarded with the SUCCESS AWARDS; the project numbered 2001 and coded M2018-23107, the project numbered 2009 and coded M2018-26577, the project numbered 2035 and coded M2018-23488, the project numbered 2041 and coded M2018-25299, the project numbered 2047 and coded M2018-29673, the project numbered 2050 and coded M2018-27466, the project numbered 2059 and coded M2018-26734, the project numbered 2062 and coded M2018-27992 were awarded with the JURY SPECIAL AWARD.

The jury report on the awarded projects

One of the primary duties of the jury is to evaluate what architecture is/could be and how it could be produced, and these issues point to more than one way of thinking. The projects 2012 and 2040 defined different ways of thinking on/about architecture, thus they were both found successful, and were both granted an equivalent success award.

2012 | M2018-27584 Equivalent Success Award

The project is very successful both in relationship to the context and in creation of poetic spaces, and the images convey these. It was found as a subtle but very strong gesture to the environment. However, the dialogue between written sources and citizens should be expressed more. The project was awarded with the success award.

2040 | M2018-24764 Equivalent Success Award

The project poses a criticism on the general impression of defining only the apparent and drawn buildings as architecture. It does not restrict architecture to the tangible, constructed, physical structures, but it interprets and forms it out of objects, memory, streets and people, and this was found as a different approach. Working in a disputed area such as Tarlabaşı, the project produces something through the very inhabitants of the area around the theme peace, which is valued. It is found worthy, as a project technique, it uses narrative as a tool of creating space. Also, the project is sensitive to the forces of its surroundings, it adapts itself according to them, and thus is contextual. However, the spatial qualities of the project are not articulated enough, and rather arbitrary. The project was awarded with the success award.

2001 | M2018-23107 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The experimental approach of the project is found plausible, and its sensitivity to the current and pressing issues is appreciated. The urgency of the contemporary city structure is understandable, yet the scale of the project is still regarded as overwhelming. The project was awarded with the jury special award by the majority vote.

2009 | M2018-26577 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The project suggests a sound response to the needs of Bergama. The flow of spaces and the flow between interior and exterior areas is commendable. There are a variety of spaces and opportunities to

experience the surrounding area and the building itself. Terraces and interior viewing spaces are powerful enough, but the scale and massing of the project takes the potential away. The relation of the project to the context is found disproportionate, it could have been more modest regarding this aspect. Some of the structural elements appear to be arbitrary to the architectural language of the project. The project was awarded with the jury special award by the majority vote.

2035 | M2018-23488 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The project was experimental and sensitive. It also thoroughly analyzed the text it is referring to. However, while the project conveys a sense of process, the spatial quality could be further developed. The project was awarded with the jury special award by the majority vote.

2041 | M2018-25299 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The experimental and unconventional approach to a conventional issue is appreciated and is encouraged. The presentation is successful in showing how life unfolds. However, the spaces require more of a spatial approach, rather than a graphic one; it appeals more graphically than spatially. The project was awarded with the jury special award by the majority vote.

2047 | M2018-29673 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The project shows a very sensitive and applicable approach to a very conventional way of life. It reveals the potential and reinterprets the culture of neighborhood life. However, considering the scale of the project, in terms of detail and material, it needed more articulation and elaboration of spaces. The project was awarded with the jury special award by the majority vote.

2050 | M2018-27466 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The project proposes a very rational solution to the problem and to the site. The research phase is commendable, and the information attained from the research is well reflected to the project. The presentation is very legible. Even though it covers a big area, the scale of the project is found very positive, both in urban and human scale. However, the project needed to show how the life unfolds, how the spaces and the minor areas work, in more detail. The project was awarded with the jury special award by the majority vote.

2059 | M2018-26734 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

Spatialization of a process through a promenade is very convincing and in coherence with the uses. The project is very well adjusted with the topography, it works with it. However, the project needs improvement, and the layouts need articulation, to give an idea of how life unfolds here. The project was awarded with the jury special award by the majority vote.

2062 | M2018-27992 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The concept is followed through in coherence in both with representation and spatialization. Difficult forms are successfully articulated. Yet, the relation of the project with the surrounding buildings is questionable and needs improvement. The project was awarded with the jury special award by the majority vote.

3rd Year Category

On the online pre-elimination projects with the code number M2018-30029, M2018-30108, M2018-30109, M2018-30155, M2018-30180, M2018-30196, M2018-30214, M2018-30273, M2018-30318, M2018-30365, M2018-30439, M2018-30498, M2018-30508, M2018-30513, M2018-30653, M2018-30716, M2018-30789, M2018-30852, M2018-30861, M2018-30947, M2018-30954, M2018-30974, M2018-30996, M2018-31039, M2018-31077, M2018-31200, M2018-31361, M2018-31378, M2018-31410, M2018-31411, M2018-31456, M2018-31630, M2018-31660, M2018-31668, M2018-31674, M2018-31785, M2018-31831, M2018-31863, M2018-31975, M2018-31979, M2018-32019, M2018-32071, M2018-32079, M2018-32091, M2018-32158, M2018-32259, M2018-32268, M2018-32278, M2018-32301, M2018-32324, M2018-32376, M2018-32522, M2018-32802,

M2018-32843, M2018-32907, M2018-32916, M2018-32920, M2018-32939, M2018-33001, M2018-33134, M2018-33220, M2018-33273, M2018-33303, M2018-33315, M2018-33323, M2018-33366, M2018-33435, M2018-33459, M2018-33653, M2018-33731, M2018-33781, M2018-33822, M2018-33888, M2018-33967, M2018-34042, M2018-34087, M2018-34129, M2018-34266, M2018-34271, M2018-34431, M2018-34471, M2018-34474, M2018-34475, M2018-34496, M2018-34507, M2018-34537, M2018-34620, M2018-34660, M2018-34783, M2018-34894, M2018-35110, M2018-35129, M2018-35147, M2018-35235, M2018-35254, M2018-35336, M2018-35386, M2018-35388, M2018-35490, M2018-35512, M2018-35520, M2018-35720, M2018-35732, M2018-35760, M2018-35792, M2018-35962, M2018-35985, M2018-36014, M2018-36020, M2018-36137, M2018-36142, M2018-36228, M2018-36259, M2018-36285, M2018-36405, M2018-36418, M2018-36516, M2018-36548, M2018-36721, M2018-36724, M2018-36809, M2018-36868, M2018-36888, M2018-36931, M2018-36968, M2018-37022, M2018-37161, M2018-37166, M2018-37220, M2018-37296, M2018-37363, M2018-37407, M2018-37433, M2018-37457, M2018-37505, M2018-37520, M2018-37568, M2018-37569, M2018-37586, M2018-37735, M2018-37761, M2018-37798, M2018-37806, M2018-38033, M2018-38035, M2018-38047, M2018-38089, M2018-38180, M2018-38214, M2018-38218, M2018-38293, M2018-38337, M2018-38630, M2018-38676, M2018-38783, M2018-38815, M2018-38897, M2018-38932, M2018-38951, M2018-39002, M2018-39046, M2018-39169, M2018-39202, M2018-39223, M2018-39242, M2018-39596, M2018-39626, M2018-39697, M2018-39702, M2018-39728, M2018-39758, M2018-39767, M2018-39792, M2018-39803, M2018-39813 and M2018-39852 were eliminated [176 projects].

On the first round projects numbered 3001, 3004, 3007, 3008, 3009, 3010, 3012, 3014, 3015, 3016, 3017, 3018, 3019, 3022, 3025, 3026, 3027, 3028, 3030, 3031, 3032, 3034, 3037, 3040, 3043, 3044, 3046, 3047, 3048, 3052, 3053, 3054, 3060, 3061, 3062, 3065, 3066, 3068, 3071, 3072, 3074, 3075, 3077, 3079, 3080, 3083, 3085, 3086, 3089 and 3090 were eliminated because they did not meet at least three of the five criteria determined by the jury which are conceptualization, response to context, spatial articulation, representation and the development of the project [50 projects].

On the second round projects numbered 3006, 3011, 3013, 3020, 3021, 3024, 3033, 3035, 3036, 3042, 3045, 3049, 3055, 3056, 3057, 3058, 3059, 3063, 3064, 3067, 3070, 3073, 3076, 3078, 3081, 3082, 3084 and 3087 were eliminated [28 projects].

The jury report on the eliminated projects on the 2nd round

3006 While the project has an idea on how to transform the space and the detail level is developed, the translation to architectural space is weak. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3011 The level of integration of the project with its surroundings was found positive, but how it functions remained unclear and the details were found underdeveloped. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3013 The jury's comment on the relation to topography was positive and the connection of the interior space to the exterior was found strong, but the spatial articulation of the project remained weak. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3020 Although the idea is original and the project has potential about the integration of the vertical street and the housing units, the spatial integration overall was found weak. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3021 While the way of dealing with extreme conditions was found positive, the interior spaces were found too conventional in relation to the projects context and the organization in the level of plan was found weak. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3024 The opinion of the jury on the systematic of space was positive, but the relation to the environment was found weak. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3033 The intention of creating a collective space was appreciated, but how the project works remained unclear. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3035 Although the approach is unique and the concept strong, the transformation to space was found weak. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3036 The representation of the project was found positive, but the relation of the context to the environment is insufficient. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3042 The relation of the project to its environment is unique but it is not harmonious with the urban fabric. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3045 While the approach of architectural planning was found clear in a positive way, the effects to space is not visible and the urban fabric is not taken into account. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3049 The jury found the criticism of society positive, but the architectural end product was found insufficient. The project was eliminated unanimously.

3055 The projects response to innovation is laudable and the representation coherent, but the reflection of the maker culture is not visible. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3056 Although the projects ambience is positive, the architectural articulation remains underdeveloped. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3057 While the structural system provides spatial quality and the form-function relation is positive, the project is too graphical and the relation to the city questionable. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3058 The spatial quality which matches also the new media functions is successful and original. However, the relation with the context and scale was found problematic also biologic interventions are found unclear. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3059 The project was found very promising in terms of establishing to the site. However, the approach to the park is very formal and translation of the idea is too direct that become unnecessarily strong. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3063 While the approach in the scale of site plan has good intentions, relation with the natural context is found questionable. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3064 The drawings are very clear but the plans were found raw. Topographical information was missing. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3067 The project shows potential however, the question of how this project contributes to city is found questionable. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3070 The idea of design structure work as a tower itself was found very positive. The form is technically developed. Project is nicely shown and documented well and understandable. However, its relation with the environment was found problematic. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3073 The relationship between space and discourse was found consistent. In the scale of masterplan project seems remarkable but on the level of human eye, there were weak connections and the form becomes too plastic. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3076 The idea is very well elaborated. However, how it integrated into the sea was unclear. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3078 The concept of the project has potential, but the spatial articulation needs development. Also the representations are not sufficient in terms of showing how life unfolds here.

3081 Project is nicely visualized which documents remarkably. It has obviously an interesting background. However, spatial features cannot be read clearly with the context of built environment. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3082 The projects concept was found ambitious by the jury. However, the relation with the neighborhood has no sensitivity. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3084 While the architectural planning is successful, the solutions for the public spaces are too generic. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3087 The response to the environment was found positive, but the project needs overall more development. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

On the third round projects numbered 3041, 3050 and 3051 were eliminated [3 projects].

The jury report on the eliminated projects on the 3rd round

3041 The first approach and drawings were found positive, but the project does not learn from Cappadocia. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3050 The sense of the space is very well represented. The constructive actions were found problematic with the context. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

3051 The project is very experimental, but the context and the sense of space is questionable. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

Remaining 9 projects were decided to form the award group. Accordingly project numbered 3023 and coded M2018-32681 was awarded with the SUCCESS AWARD, the project numbered 3002 and coded M2018-32221 was awarded with the ENCOURAGEMENT AWARD, the project numbered 3003 and coded M2018-35691, the project numbered 3005 and coded M2018-34248, the project numbered 3029 and coded M2018-26429, the project numbered 3038 and coded M2018-31733, the project numbered 3039 and coded M2018-32944, the project numbered 3069 and coded M2018-30592, the project numbered 3088 and coded M2018-30984 were awarded with the JURY SPECIAL AWARD.

The jury report on the awarded projects

3023 | M2018-32681 SUCCESS AWARD

The idea that is straighten with the representations with various scales and details was found very positive. Project is taken as a thinking and experimenting process and generate carefully considered relations between the programs. The aim of original interpretation on the market place creates an intensive hybridity so that market place works as a catalyzer that creates spatial qualities.

3002 | M2018-32221 ENCOURAGEMENT AWARD

The project answers the chaotic structure of the city with producing chaos with its own rationalities and aesthetic language. Project accentuates its value with its conscious distance from land. Also the sketches that explain the design process were found remarkable.

3003 | M2018-35691 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The experimental approach of the project was encouraged. Difficult forms are successfully articulated, but overall form still has a sense of arbitrariness. Although, approaching form wise, it would only be plausible in a deserted quarry, considering the qualities of the region in general.

3005 | M2018-34248 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

With the reference of the information itself as a transforming and changing phenomenon, project is generated as a fluid and variant which is found strongly positive. Project is also examines the architecture with the 'new'. Lightweight structure system has the potential of regenerate itself with different conditions and time therefore, creates various life scenarios. These criteria is also found remarkable.

3029 | M2018-26429 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

While living in the post-industrial period, working in an abandoned industrial area by interpreting also the former dynamics of the space was found positive. Transforming the existing building by adding new type of functions are apprehensible. The permeability of the interior and exterior is successful.

3038 | M2018-31733 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The relation with the topography and analysis that indicated the potential of the site was found positive. There potentials are successfully transformed into the spatial interventions.

3039 | M2018-32944 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

Project's aspect of creating potentials of spatial transformation without demolition was found valuable. Sensitive approach on identity of the neighborhood is remarkable. The inputs of the local culture are involved in the spatialization of the project. However, project was expected to be more mature in term of details and spatiality.

3069 | M2018-30592 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The sense and the atmosphere of the space is very well represented. Proposals on new life scenarios and processing and implementing the ideas with different aspects is found strongly positive.

3088 | M2018-30984 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The analysis of the existing site is examined successfully, and the information come from there are successfully integrated to the project. Secondary uses are enriched the spatial development.

4th Year Category

On the online pre-elimination projects with the code number M2018-40465, M2018-40507, M2018-41229, M2018-41268, M2018-41808, M2018-41949, M2018-42231, M2018-42237, M2018-42651, M2018-43198, M2018-43511, M2018-43980, M2018-44118, M2018-44677, M2018-45002, M2018-45036, M2018-45246, M2018-45590, M2018-45730, M2018-45740, M2018-45853, M2018-46294, M2018-46793, M2018-46826, M2018-47051, M2018-47122, M2018-47649, M2018-47755, M2018-47810, M2018-47947, M2018-48029, M2018-48216, M2018-48603, M2018-48678, M2018-48726, M2018-49073, M2018-49130, M2018-49236, M2018-49275 and M2018-49978 were eliminated [40 projects].

On the first round projects numbered 4002, 4003, 4005, 4010, 4012, 4013, 4014, 4016, 4019, 4023, 4025, 4027, 4030, 4032, 4035, 4039, 4040, 4041, 4043, 4046, 4047, 4048 and 4049 were eliminated because they did not meet at least three of the five criteria determined by the jury which are conceptualization, response to context, spatial articulation, representation and the development of the project [23 projects].

On the second round projects numbered 4001, 4004, 4015, 1017, 4018, 4020, 4022, 4024, 4026, 4036, 4037, 4038, 4042 and 4045 were eliminated [14 projects].

The jury report on the eliminated projects on the 2nd round

4001 The idea is found commendable, however, the final spatialization is found quite conventional without an innovation. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4004 Response to the context is found remarkable with architectural representation, however it is thought that the project should be developed more. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4015 The theme of the project is considered positive but the overall study is found underdeveloped. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4017 The project site as an isolated terrain vague area and its use is found commendable, however it is thought that representations should be more expressive. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4018 The responsible approach to dense neighborhood in a profit-oriented area physically is found positive but socially it is found underdeveloped. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4020 The representation of the project is found quite remarkable but the spatial organization and working of the scenario are found underdeveloped. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4022 The urban development of the project is found commendable, however it is also found too monumental as an articulation and there is a misunderstanding of topography. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4024 The background research of the project is quite remarkable but the spatiality is found undeveloped. The project was eliminated unanimously.

4026 Open air museum idea is found quite qualified and well-represented, however the relationship between form and structure is found not commendable. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4036 Understanding the space and process of the project are found really developed, however the spatialization and construction of the project remain too conventional. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4037 The systematic approach of the project is found convenient but the integration with nature is found not commendable. It is thought that the life scenario that the project offers cannot read thoroughly. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4038 The collectiveness theme is found as a positive starting point but it is found that the scale is too small for working it out. The project was eliminated unanimously.

4042 The topographic approach of the project and public spaces between buildings are appreciated, however it is thought that interior space and life should be more improved. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4045 The idea of the project is found quite interesting, however the embodiment is found insufficient. The project was eliminated by the majority vote. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

On the third round projects numbered 4006, 4009, 4021 and 4033 were eliminated [4 projects].

The jury report on the eliminated projects on the 3rd round

4006 The idea of increasing the relationship with urban context through the attempt of underground inhabiting is found quite positive, however the project remains very massive. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4009 Approach to the context is found very understandable but it is also found that superimposition is a heavy intervention. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4021 The holistic view and the coherence of the study are found remarkable. Structural and spatial relationships are considered positive but the project is also found too introverted. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

4033 The conceptual background and research are found remarkable and innovative, however the fragmented attempt of the project is found not commendable. The project was eliminated by the majority vote.

Remaining 8 projects were decided to form the award group. Accordingly project numbered 4029 and coded M2018-41365 was awarded with the SUCCESS AWARD, the project numbered 4011 and coded M2018-40502 was awarded with the ENCOURAGEMENT AWARD, the project numbered 4007 and coded M2018-41760, the project numbered 4008 and coded M2018-45463, the project numbered 4028 and coded M2018-47416, the project numbered 4031 and coded M2018-45105, the project numbered 4034 and coded M2018-41447, the project numbered 4044 and coded M2018-43531 were awarded with the JURY SPECIAL AWARD.

The jury report on the awarded projects

4029 | M2018-41365 SUCCESS AWARD

It is thought that the overall research process is reflected to the each phase of the development of the project with consistency and the use of representation forms together with ideational dimension in the process of spatial creation very positive. The method of using diagrammatic visual modes and connecting those with the spatial generation as a research structure is found qualified. The relationship that the project tries to set up with urban fabric is found very strong, however it is recommended to develop the representative expressions about how the architectural space works. The project was awarded with SUCCESS AWARD by the majority vote.

4011 | M2018-40502 ENCOURAGEMENT AWARD

The attempt of considering the urban memory of recent era of the project site and the relationship with the constructiveness of the proposal are found qualified. The progressive and non-lithified character of the project is found positive, however it is thought that the limit of the intervention could be more developed. The relationship with the city and habitants is found remarkable and the project was awarded with ENCOURAGEMENT AWARD by the majority vote.

4007 | M2018-41760 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

Systematic and technical approach together with the spatial relationships are found positive but it is also thought that the relationship with environment and the scale should be reconsidered. The project was awarded with JURY SPECIAL AWARD by the majority vote.

4008 | M2018-45463 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

Physical and technical details regarding to scale and mass are found remarkable in the urban context, however spatial operation which is expressed in the conceptual process is found underdeveloped. The project was awarded with JURY SPECIAL AWARD by the majority vote.

4028 | M2018-47416 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

Physical formation and its spatial representation is found consistent, however the relationship with urban context and opportunities that the project offers cannot be read thoroughly. The project was awarded with JURY SPECIAL AWARD by the majority vote.

4031 | M2018-45105 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

Physical solutions and spatialization are found quite commendable. It is also thought that architectural representation has a strong potential but the conceptual process which generates the project is considered underdeveloped. The project was awarded with JURY SPECIAL AWARD by the majority vote.

4034 | M2018-41447 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

Conceptual research and its visual representations are found positive. Although the spatial situation of the basic architectural forms indicate a particular quality, it is also found not adequate. The project was awarded with JURY SPECIAL AWARD by the majority vote.

4044 | M2018-43531 JURY SPECIAL AWARD

The physical compatibility with the environment where the project settled and the relationship with the physical conditions are found commendable. Although the spatial formation and perception are found qualified, it is also thought that the footprint of the project on the nature should be reconsidered. The project was awarded with JURY SPECIAL AWARD by the majority vote.