

## **Reinterpreting Tradition: Contemporary Insights Towards Button House Technique**

### **Jury Evaluation Reports**

#### **A / GENERAL INFORMATION**

Online Jury Information Meetings: 14.10.2024 05:00-06:00 pm. and 07.11.2024 03:30-04:30 pm.

Online jury evaluation session 1: 20.03.2025 04:30-07:30 pm.

Online jury evaluation session 2: 21.03.2025 06:30-08:30 pm.

Online jury evaluation session 3: 24.03.2025 06:30-08:30pm.

Reinterpreting Tradition: Contemporary Insights Towards Button House Technique Jury Evaluations consisted of three main online phases. These evaluations were planned as a 3-day meeting. All of the main jury members and rapporteurs attended all sessions.

#### **Main Jury Members:**

Ayşen Ciravoğlu (Head of the Jury)-Prof. Dr., Yıldız Technical University

Ömer Selçuk Baz-Architect, Yalın Architecture

Bohdan Bis Lisowski-Architect, Association of Polish Architects

Antonio Raffaele Riverso-Prof., International Academy of Architecture

Alper Gülle-Msc. Architect, Antalya Bilim University

#### **Alternate Jury Members:**

Sadık Gökhan Ekinci-Dr. Architect, Akdeniz University

Ekrem Bahadır Çalışkan-Asst. Prof. Dr. Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University

#### **Advisory Jury:**

Kemal Reha Kavas-Prof. Dr., Akdeniz University

Ali Olgu Ceylan-Msc. Architect, Akdeniz Association of Licensed Architects

Funda Alyanak Kaya-Msc. Architect, Antalya Bilim University

#### **Rapporteurs:**

Merve Artkan

Serim Aygen Kıştin

Zeynep Ceren Durgut

\*\*\*Please note that the project and registration number matching is provided in the appendix table at the end of the document.

## **B / PREPARATION PROCESS**

A total of 75 projects were applied to the competition. Among these applications, 6 projects (P17, P34, P45, P48, P67, P75) were excluded from the evaluation because of late submission and 7 projects (P02, P20, P21, P32, P51, P64, P70) were excluded from the evaluation because they did not comply with the specifications about student status. They were either graduates or not from an architecture department. The situation was presented to the jury in the first online session and unanimously accepted by the jury.

It was decided that the remaining 62 projects would be presented to the jury for evaluation. The identity and school information of the project teams were meticulously kept confidential by the rapporteurs until the end of the evaluation process. The rapporteurs assigned numbers to each project and also kept the registration codes confidential. The jury conducted all evaluation studies based on the project numbers given to the projects by the rapporteurs.

## **C / ONLINE JURY EVALUATION SESSION 1**

Before the online evaluation session, the rapporteurs shared the folders where project panels could be reviewed and the project list including project numbers, and poster and report eligibility with all jury members.

Before the online evaluation stage, forms were sent to the main jury members, where they could mark whether they found it appropriate to participate in the evaluation session for 62 projects. Each jury member could only access their own individual form and made their evaluations individually. At this stage, the jury members were not asked to make an evaluation for the projects, they were only asked to give positive/negative opinions.

At the end of this process, projects that did not receive a positive vote from any jury member were eliminated in the first round. The remaining projects were advanced to the next round to participate in the online evaluation session.

### **1st Elimination Round**

The 62 projects that met the requirements stated in the competition brief were evaluated online by the jury. In the 1st rounds, which were held online, the jury evaluated the projects by taking into account the quality of the architectural approach and creativity, the integration of the project in the site, its functionality, the clarity of the organization of the programmed elements, the quality and flexibility of the proposed spaces, the quality of the aesthetical and architectural expression, the adequacy of the proposed materiality and construction, aspects of environmental and social sustainability, and coherence of the project along with the technical feasibility and constructability criteria.

Projects that did not receive a positive vote from any jury member were eliminated unanimously in the first round. A total of 20 projects (P01, P07, P08, P11, P13, P25, P29, P33, P36, P35, P37, P40, P49, P52, P56, P57, P59, P63, P68, P74) were eliminated in this elimination round.

## **2nd Elimination Round**

The remaining 42 projects were evaluated in the second round and 32 of these projects were eliminated in this round.

### **Eliminated Project Reports:**

**P03 (0/5):** The buildability of the project was positively noted, reflecting a practical and executable design approach. However, the proposal was found to lack innovation and demonstrated a weak connection to the buttoned house technique. The excessive repetition of identical elements further limited the project's ability to offer a creative or meaningful interpretation of the competition's core theme. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P04 (1/5):** The flexibility of the project was found to be weak, and its rigid boundaries were criticized. The project was eliminated in the second round by a majority vote.

**P09 (1/5):** The project's inability to integrate effectively with the green area was identified as a key issue. The roof structure appeared disproportionately heavy, affecting both spatial balance and structural clarity. Scale inconsistencies, particularly in dimensioning and proportional relationships, further impacted the feasibility and coherence of the proposal. The project was eliminated in the second round by a majority vote.

**P14 (0/5):** The proposal was not clearly communicated through the presentation materials which affected the overall clarity and architectural readability of the proposal. The visualizations focused solely on exterior views, making it difficult to understand the spatial organization and internal qualities of the design. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P16 (0/5):** The project was found to be insufficiently developed both in terms of spatial organization and architectural approach. It lacked a distinctive interpretation of the competition concept and theme, resulting in a proposal that did not demonstrate a strong concept or design approach. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P19 (0/5):** The design was found rigid and heavy. The project was considered to require further development to articulate its spatial and conceptual potentials. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P22 (0/5):** The project was found to have a weak relationship with the buttoned house typology, limiting its alignment with the central theme and objectives of the competition. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P23 (0/5):** The project was considered to include an excessive amount of built volume, which impacted its relationship with the site and open spaces. The overall closed areas were found to exceed the expectations outlined in the competition brief. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P24 (0/5):** The project's minimal structural design was found to lack sufficient spatial articulation. Furthermore, the proposal did not demonstrate a clear interpretation of, or spatial relationship with, the buttoned house technique. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P27 (0/5):** The project was presented as a single architectural space (stand-alone structure), and it was observed that it did not establish a strong relationship with its context. Additionally, the spatial development, architectural narrative, and presentation technique were found to lack the level of maturity expected at this stage. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P28 (0/5):** The design was considered to place an excessive emphasis on formal concerns. The relationship between the ceiling design and the walls appeared unresolved, and the integration between the architectural form and the landscape design was found to be insufficient. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P31 (2/5):** The project was recognized as a detailed and buildable proposal, with a straightforward architectural approach reminiscent of a shelter. While this clarity was viewed positively, the design was found to lack creativity both in its spatial and technical strategies. Due to its limited originality and insufficient alignment with the competition's expectations for an innovative interpretation, it was eliminated by majority vote.

**P39 (1/5):** The flexibility introduced by the idea of an interlocking wooden structure and blocks made of recycled paper was positively received. However, the concept was considered underdeveloped and in need of further architectural refinement. Additionally, the project was found to lack a clear connection to the core theme of the competition, particularly in relation to the buttoned house technique. The project was eliminated in the second round by a majority vote.

**P42 (1/5):** While the project's relationship with the landscape was positively noted, it was considered to lack sufficient spatial maturity. The interpretation of the buttoned house technique was also found to be weak, limiting the proposal's alignment with the competition's thematic focus. The project was eliminated in the second round by a majority vote.

**P43 (0/5):** The project's modern architectural language was positively received. However, its relationship with the buttoned house typology was found to be overly abstract and not well integrated with the overall competition concept. Additionally, the design was observed to have accessibility issues, particularly in terms of inclusive access for students with disabilities. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P44 (0/5):** The project was considered to lack any meaningful relationship with its surrounding context. Its treatment as a singular installation was viewed negatively, as it limited the potential for integration within the site. Furthermore, the spatial configuration was found to be underdeveloped and did not demonstrate the level of architectural maturity expected. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P46 (0/5):** The project was found to have a weak relationship with its surrounding environment and demonstrated a limited spatial approach. It was also observed that the proposal did not present a creative or original interpretation of the buttoned house technique, which was central to the competition's theme. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P47 (0/5):** The project's spatial approach was found to be insufficiently developed, lacking clarity and depth in spatial organization. Additionally, its connection to the surrounding context remained weak, reducing the overall coherence of the design within its environment. Moreover,

it lacked a distinctive and innovative reinterpretation of the buttoned house technique, which is a key component of the competition brief. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P50 (0/5):** The spatial organization and configuration within the structure were found to be weak and lacking clarity. The relationship between the building and its surrounding environment was also considered insufficient. Additionally, the use of arched windows on one side and modern openings on the other resulted in an inconsistent architectural language, making it difficult to define a clear and coherent character for the building. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P53 (0/5):** The project was considered to lack any meaningful relationship with its surrounding context. The one-space design was considered to lack sufficient spatial maturity. The interpretation of the buttoned house technique was also found to be weak. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P54 (0/5):** The flexibility of the proposed structural system was positively acknowledged. However, the use of brick in the project was not considered meaningful, as the material did not require the use of the buttoned house technique for its assembly. For this reason, the choice of brick was viewed as a limitation in terms of structural approach. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P55 (0/5):** The project's spatial configuration and its relationship with the landscape were evaluated positively, reflecting a considered and well-integrated design approach. However, the proposed timber construction technique was seen as lacking a strong connection to the traditional Buttoned House system, which limited the project's alignment with the competition's core theme. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P58 (0/5):** The project's spatial strategy was perceived as underdeveloped, lacking clarity and depth in its internal organization. Its limited engagement with the surrounding context was seen to weaken its overall integration with the site. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P60 (0/5):** The spatial configuration was perceived as overly complex, which affected the overall clarity of the design. The positioning of the structure within the site was regarded as generic, lacking a clear contextual response. Furthermore, the project demonstrated a limited engagement with the Buttoned House typology, which reduced its alignment with the competition's thematic framework. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P61 (1/5):** The simplicity of the spatial layout was positively evaluated, and the initial sketches were appreciated for their clarity and strength. However, in the finalized proposal, the roof structure and stone walls were not found to be as effective, reducing the overall architectural impact of the design. The project was eliminated in the second round by a majority vote.

**P62 (0/5):** The use of varying levels and dynamic sectional movements was positively received, contributing to the spatial richness of the proposal. However, the project was observed to lack a creative and original interpretation of the buttoned house technique. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P64 (0/5):** The project was considered to have not reached sufficient spatial maturity. Both the spatial organization and the relationship with the surrounding context were found to be weak, limiting the overall coherence and architectural depth of the proposal.

**P65 (0/5):** The project was composed solely of structural elements, which was found to be insufficient in delivering a complete architectural experience. An original and creative interpretation related to the buttoned house typology was not observed. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P69 (0/5):** The project was considered to lack sufficient spatial configuration. Additionally, the interpretation of the buttoned house technique was found to be weak, resulting in a limited alignment with the competition's conceptual framework. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P71 (0/5):** The construction methodology proposed in the project was found to have a weak connection with the traditional buttoned house technique, limiting its relevance to the core architectural intentions of the competition. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P72 (0/5):** The project was found to be insufficiently developed in terms of spatial organization and architectural approach. It lacked a distinctive interpretation of the competition concept and theme, resulting in a proposal that did not demonstrate a strong concept or design approach. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

**P73 (0/5):** The design's flexibility and the clarity of its presentation techniques were positively noted. However, the overall scale of the project was considered to significantly exceed the expectations outlined in the competition brief, with an extensive building footprint and a high degree of development across the site. The project was unanimously eliminated by the jury.

## **D / ONLINE JURY EVALUATION SESSION 2**

### **3rd Elimination Round**

The jury met online for the second time to evaluate the remaining projects. The remaining 10 projects were evaluated in the third round and 4 of these projects were eliminated in this round.

#### **Eliminated Project Reports:**

**P06 (0/5):** The idea of fluid spaces shaped by flexible and free walls, along with their connection to traditional wall-building techniques, was found to be fundamentally impressive. Additionally, the technical drawings and level of detailing were considered highly refined and architecturally strong. However, the so-called flexible space was found to be overly rigid and unchanging, contradicting its fluid definition. The enclosed and heavy character of the space, along with its excessively large roof structure, was criticized. Furthermore, the way the site plan extends across the entire garden was considered a drawback. It was considered out of scale and excessively spread across the site. Its relationship with the surrounding environment was deemed insufficient, and the site plan decisions were evaluated as overly dense. The project was unanimously eliminated in the third round.

**P18 (2/5):** The strong and impactful installation character created in the center of the garden has been found impressive. The originality of this installation and its reference to tradition are also quite striking. However, the fact that it has been designed solely as an installation and a partially defined play area has been met with hesitation. Additionally, the use of an iron scaffold instead of wood has raised concerns about safety vulnerabilities due to climbing and play activities. The project's environmental integration was considered limited, and the placement of the structure was seen as lacking clarity. The absence of a clearly articulated function within the design was viewed as a missed opportunity. While the use of steel to reinterpret the Buttoned House technique was appreciated, the decision to retain the original wooden dimensions was questioned in terms of material appropriateness. Despite these efforts, the project was not selected for advancement and was eliminated in the third round by a majority vote.

**P38 (1/5):** The project's highly dynamic and creative loop geometry was found to be particularly attractive. Moreover, this compelling idea was expressed in an exceptionally competent and impactful manner. However, the jury questioned the relationship between this creativity and the materiality/gravity of the structure. There seems to be a stark contrast between the proposed form and the construction techniques and materials used. It is evident that the project should be reconsidered by its creators, not just as a graphic representation of architecture, but in terms of buildability and its connection to materials and physical realities.

**P66 (1/5):** The design concept brings together micro-living experiences through a diverse and layered approach. This richness and energy are clearly and powerfully expressed in a series of meticulously crafted drawings and illustrations, spanning from representation techniques to spatial design. However, the scale of this multi-layered approach, which exceeds the intended scope and requirements in the site plan, was questioned by the jury. The overuse of the area was evaluated negatively, and the project was considered overdesigned and out of scale.

Additionally, the transformation of the buttoned wall tectonics from a structural element into a merely decorative feature was criticized. The use of stone walls was criticized for making the project overly rigid and lacking flexibility. The same design approach could have been more effective if the steel structural gaps were filled with different materials. The weak relationship between material choice and content was a key point of critique. The project was eliminated in the third round by a majority vote.

## **E / ONLINE JURY EVALUATION SESSION 3**

### **Final Round**

The jury met online for the third time to evaluate the remaining projects. The remaining 6 projects were evaluated and discussed in the final round. An additional open voting round was held to determine the final ranking. According to the voting results, projects are ranked. The top three were determined, and the remaining three projects received honorable mention awards.

## **Project Reports:**

### **Equivalent Honorable Mention**

**P41 (0/5):** The alternative open and closed spaces created with curved walls within the garden were praised for their atmosphere and character. Additionally, the unexpected and experiential relationship these soft spaces establish with the landscape was appreciated. The inconsistent geometries within the plan, the representation of curved buttoned walls as mere cladding elements rather than structural components, the overall scale of the project, and the undefined roof character were all criticized.

Furthermore, the site-specific approach was considered insufficient. The form was found to be aesthetically pleasing and conveyed a sense of lightness, yet the geometry lacked cohesion.

Although the project demonstrated a promising starting point, the core idea was seen as requiring further development. Despite its design quality, it was ultimately deemed not fully aligned with the objectives of this competition. Additionally, the technical drawings were found to be inconsistent with the proposed material choices, and the spatial organization was considered a missed opportunity to achieve stronger functional integration.

### **Equivalent Honorable Mention**

**P30 (2/5):** The idea of creating a loosely composed space within the garden using independent floors and walls has been positively received. The soft relationship established between these free spaces and the green area is also seen as a positive aspect. Additionally, the proposal is considered to be at a level of simplicity that students themselves could potentially construct, which has been evaluated favorably.

Despite its strengths, the lack of centrality in the use of buttoned walls and the perceived insufficiency of spatial composition in terms of quality and definition have been criticized by some jury members.

While the functions were noted to be separate yet connected, the spatial relationships and the definition of individual spaces were found to be insufficient. Additionally, the absence of a roof was seen as a major drawback in terms of climatic conditions, reducing the project's adaptability.

Overall, the design demonstrated potential but was perceived as not fully resolved in terms of spatial clarity. The distinction between semi-open and enclosed areas remained ambiguous, which affected the project's ability to define space effectively. Consequently, the predominance of open areas was seen to limit both its functional versatility and its responsiveness to environmental conditions.

### **Equivalent Honorable Mention**

**P10 (2/5):** The project's monumental and memorable design approach was highly appreciated. The free placement of elements within the garden and the spatial impact created by the defined axes in three dimensions were found to be impressive. However, the way these axes restrict



interior spaces, and their overall references were questioned by the jury. The relationship between the tunnel-like voids formed by the diagonal axis and the stone walls both created a dynamic character and presented functional challenges.

Despite the flexible and effective interior volume, the spatial relationships with the environment and nature of the composition are found difficult to comprehend and user orientation were not clearly established.

Additionally, while the stepped amphitheater structure leaning against the tunnel was seen as a positive feature by some jury members, others felt it disrupted continuity and spatial cohesion and raised concerns about its overall usability and functionality.

### **3rd Prize**

**P26 (3/5):** The tunnel-like space, freely positioned within the garden, was found successful both as an independent entity and in its three-dimensional impact. The space, formed by shifting two triangular walls, was seen as dynamic and striking. Additionally, the wooden roof structure, which extends dynamically from the walls, transforms the tunnel into a multi-layered spatial experience. Despite its strengths, the enclosed nature of the tunnel, its impact on interior space, and its placement as a terminating point without continuity in the site plan were criticized. The use of buttoned wall structures within this composition was also considered meaningful.

### **2nd Prize**

**P15 (4/5):** The project's strong and decisive spatial division along one edge of the garden was found impactful. In line with this decision, the way all open programs are directed toward the garden through various spatial tensions was also appreciated. The designed wall was evaluated as a campus landmark — marking the starting point of an experience, gathering students, accommodating various functions, and offering multiple opportunities.

However, the project's level transitions, spatial sequencing, and relationship with staircases were points of criticism. The idea of the project was found to be interesting and strong, but its execution was considered insufficient.

### **1st Prize**

**P5 (4/5):** The integrated yet fragmented spatial character created by the partitioned walls within the existing garden has been positively received and found to be simple, and strong. The project was evaluated positively for its ability to define the space and offer various options within. The relationship between open programs and walls, along with the loosely defined yet identifiable courtyard concept, was also appreciated. The spatial organization was considered flexible, and it was seen as a positive aspect that the design encouraged students to use the courtyard as a place to spend time and the inner space was positively evaluated in terms of natural light. The system connecting the partitioned elements with low eaves at the courtyard level has been criticized. Additionally, although the approach exceeds the programmatic requirements specified in the brief, it is believed that it can be adapted to the required dimensions without compromising the design character.

### Suggestions of Jury for Detailed Planning and Construction Phase:

As the first-prize-winning project will be constructed, the following improvements should be made to the conceptual design and submitted to the organization before the preparation of construction and detailed projects:

It is recommended that the total building area be reduced to a certain extent while maintaining the character defined by the courtyard and surrounding walls.

The necessity of a low, covered circulation area with eaves running along the courtyard can be reconsidered. Access to the courtyard may be defined through other architectural elements or landscape elements.

While reducing the overall building footprint, it may be considered to create under-eave spaces without wooden flooring in some sections.

After the completion of the selection and signing of the project report the following results were reached:

#### **Award Group Ranking**

##### **1st Prize**

Registration Code: 5bp5m

"Reinterpreting Tradition"

Sedat Sağlam (TED University, Türkiye)

##### **2nd Prize**

Registration Code: bnx16

"Nest"

Türkan Bıyık (Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Türkiye)

##### **3rd Prize**

Registration Code: fw4ns

"Threshold"

Satvik N Kedilaya (Dayanda Sagar Academy of Technology and Management, India)

Pratibha J H (Dayanda Sagar Academy of Technology and Management, India)

Nanditha M (BMS School of Architecture, India)

#### **Equivalent Honorable Mention**

Registration Code: 9cvx5

"space<sup>2</sup>"

Hafsa Lakhali (National school of architecture (ENA AGADIR), Morocco)

Amina Bellouch (National school of architecture (ENA AGADIR), Morocco)

**Equivalent Honorable Mention**

Registration Code: hvxwa

“Sofa”

Esra Taşdöndüren (KTO Karatay University, Türkiye)

Keziban Nur İpek (KTO Karatay University, Türkiye)

Hale Nur Ocakçı (KTO Karatay University, Türkiye)

**Equivalent Honorable Mention**

Registration Code: nf3ua

“Seamless Flow”

Gayoung Yoon (Sejong University, Republic of Korea)

Sukyoung Sun (Sejong University, Republic of Korea)

Project	Registration Number
P1	2HGSR
P2	39qbo
P3	3fqgk
P4	4fdpx
P5	5bp5m
P6	7a1ew
P7	834ai
P8	8bsc7
P9	8zlg1
P10	9cvx5
P11	9s4al
P12	arf86
P13	azkke
P14	bdhsr
P15	bnx16
P16	btldr
P17	ddm3l
P18	dffrl
P19	e7hqf
P20	enyag
P21	evgfn
P22	f5swz
P23	fhzzq
P24	fm5ix
P25	fs5xo
P26	fw4ns
P27	gasmn
P28	gcm7u
P29	gctrr
P30	hvxwa
P31	ihczz
P32	ihups
P33	iti0d
P34	jbyxs
P35	jeq5s
P36	k7fm6
P37	kdod3
P38	ko4oi
P39	kxbd3
P40	kxk2o
P41	nf3ua
P42	oftbe
P43	ogdew
P44	OJYCY

P45	p1laz
P46	pcs52
P47	pgykl
P48	pl8zn
P49	qcqqx
P50	qcvf6
P51	qvtts
P52	qwzzi
P53	ra0e4
P54	s5yei
P55	TFPUQ
P56	todmm
P57	u6yvt
P58	vdkiy
P59	ve22p
P60	VHYFX
P61	vqkeb
P62	vyk92
P63	w4emk
P64	wiy7z
P65	wphxw
P66	x9slt
P67	xuyrr
P68	y110c
P69	yjxhb
P70	ynkwi
P71	yv1yg
P72	ywk6i
P73	yzf93
P74	zst6s
P75	tlenb