

**RADANVARSI**

Ideas competition for the railway area of central Lahti, 2.4.-13.9.2012

## **Jury Report, 14.12.2012**

### **CONTENTS**

1. Description of the competition task
2. General evaluation of the competition
3. Evaluation of the individual competition entries
4. Competition results
5. Recommendations for further planning
6. Signing the competition report

## 1. Description of the competition task

### Promoter, character and objective of the competition

The City of Lahti has organised an open international urban planning ideas competition for the approximately 53-hectare area adjacent to the railway tracks in Lahti.

The objective of the competition was to find a high-quality idea for the cityscape, one that functionally takes into consideration the future development potential for realising the environment of the most central area adjacent to the railway line in Lahti. The competition entries had to be realised following the objectives of the City of Lahti's strategies for sustainable development, which include, for instance, urban ecology, energy efficiency and the pleasantness of the overall environment.

Lahti's new Travel Centre, the encounter of different traffic systems, and the ecological traffic environment were essential parts of the competition task.

It was decided to organise a general ideas competition in order to obtain as diverse views as possible as the basis for the functional and far-reaching development of the area. It was hoped that the competition would generate new ideas as a basis for the urban planning of the area.

The competition was open to the citizens of all countries of the world. The competition languages were Finnish and English.

The competition was organised in accordance with the SAFA competition rules.

### Competition jury

#### Members of the competition jury appointed by the City of Lahti

City Mayor	Jyrki Myllyvirta	Jury Chairman
Director of Technical & Environmental Services	Timo Ahonen	Jury Vice-Chairman
Director of Municipal Engineering	Jorma Vaskelainen	Jury member
Director of Land Use	Veli-Pekka Toivonen	Jury member
City Planning Architect	Kimmo Sutinen	Jury Secretary
City Architect	Anne Karvinen-Jussilainen	Jury member
Researcher	Riitta Niskanen	Jury member
Landscape Architect	Maria Silvast	Jury member
Participatory Designer	Sara Ikävalko	2nd Jury Secretary
1 <sup>st</sup> Deputy Chairman of the City Council	Hannu Himanen	Jury member
Chairman of the Technical Board	Simo Rähä	Jury member
Deputy Chairman of the Technical Board	Susanna Iivonen-Pekesen	Jury member

#### Jury members representing landowners:

Renor Ltd	Hannu Katajamäki	Jury member
VR Group	Pirjo Huvila	Jury member

Jury members appointed by the Finnish Association of Architects

Architect SAFA	Helka-Liisa Hentilä	Jury member
Architect SAFA	Johanna Hyrkäs	Jury member

The competition jury receive comments from the following expert advisors:

Finnish Transport Agency

The Home and Uusimaa Centres for  
Economic Development, Transport  
and the Environment

Head of Strategy	Santtu von Bruun
Director of Lahti Region Building Supervision Office	Raimo Luukka
Head of Environmental Protection, Lahti Region	Kari Porra
Traffic engineer	Matti Hoikkanen
Master plan architect	Johanna Palomäki
City Gardener	Hannu Neuvonen
Green City representative	Saara Vauramo
Landowners	

The Technical Secretary was Petri Peltonen.

The jury-nominated working sub-committee comprised chairperson Helka-Liisa Hentilä, and members Jyrki Myllyvirta, Anne Karvinen-Jussilainen, Johanna Hyrkäs, and Kimmo Sutinen as well as competition secretary Petri Peltonen. All members of the jury had the right to participate, if they so wished, in the meetings of the working sub-committee.

The competition jury received expert statements from the following authorities:

- VR Group, Pirjo Huvila
- Finnish Transport Agency, Heidi Mäenpää
- Ecology statement, Pasi Toiviainen
- Landowner statement, Pasi Tinnilä

Green city statement, Saara Vauramo

Lahti Region Environmental Services, Kari porra

Lahti Municipal Technology, Matti Hoikkanen

Uusimaa Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment, Liisa-Maija Thompson

The experts and jury technical secretary did not participate in the decision-making process nor did they have the right to participate in the competition.

There was broad public participation in the competition. A description of the participation is attached to the present jury report.

### **Progression of the competition**

The competition programme was released on 2.4.2012, when also possible the most important appendices to the competition programme were made available. In accordance with the programme, questions that were received by 18.5.2012 received responses at the competition seminar held on 28.5.2012 and they were published on the competition website: [www.radanvarsi.fi](http://www.radanvarsi.fi)

The competition ended at midnight on 13.9.2012. In accordance with the procedures of the competition programme, the jury received 26 proposals. Additionally, one proposal arrived late.

The proposals were numbered in the order they were opened, and according to the report of the opening, the jury received the following proposals:

1	FOUR QUARTER STRIP
2	LAITURI
3	KROKOTIILI
4	KAJO
5	PRELUDI
6	PLUG-IN CITY
7	TUNE IN CITY
8	KETJU
9	REIPAS
10	AURINKO-LAHTI
11	MONOCLE
12	GREEN-GO
13	UUDET POLUT
14	JESJ1002
15	KÄTKETTY PUUTARHA
16	JÄÄJÄRVEN HEDELMÄT
17	CARDO
18	IXIXI
19	NOTKO
20	TULIPYÖRÄ
21	ORIENT EXPRESS
22	SIEMEN
23	LAHTI CYCLE
24	PÖLKYT
25	BRIDGE

26	KIILA
27	KEHRÄ

The competition jury disqualified the competition proposal no. 27, with the pseudonym “KEHRA”, because it arrived late and programme documents were significantly lacking.

The competition jury met 8 times. The working sub-committee met 7 times.

The competition jury has reached a unanimous decision and has given its recommendations for the further planning as indicated in the present jury report.

## 2. General evaluation of the competition

### Overall evaluation

In their evaluation work, the jury emphasised the following principals regarding the proposals:

- A unique and comprehensive idea for the area, an urban design vision and the functionality of the solution.
- In general, the feasibility and potential for the further development of the proposal; for instance, a staggered implementation.
- The functionally compact design of the Travel Centre complex.
- Urban design that supports a sustainable and ecological lifestyle.
- The creation of an area identity.
- Solutions that support a car-independent mobility culture and the use of public transport as well as pedestrian and bicycle traffic.
- Innovative green concepts.
- Taking into consideration and developing the existing surroundings and buildings.
- Taking into consideration the history of the area.

In their assessment, the jury emphasised in particular that the planning and building of the competition area plays an important role in the concrete implementation of Lahti’s green city strategy as well as increasing the attraction of the city. Therefore in the assessment solutions have been ranked high which are both comprehensive and visionary.

Even though the entries were few in number, they represented a wide array of different views of the future of the area. Proposals that could be characterised as ordinary were few in number. The top proposals were of a very high quality. The proposals presented diverse alternatives for the future of the area.

In some of the proposals the methods and amount of building, however, did not seem plausible in relation to the size and growth predications for the city of Lahti. In some proposals the authors had become enamoured by a certain idea or building typology and were not able to apply their idea to the

circumstances and objectives of the competition area. Focusing on building in just one part of the competition area was also seen as a mistake.

In the best proposals the authors presented a unique and comprehensive land-use vision which had been refined and adapted to the competition area and where it was possible to demonstrate the potential of the competition area as part of the development of the central zone of Lahti.

The alignment of Mannerheiminkatu street had – surprisingly enough – only been altered in a few of the proposals. And of these, only in one (Preludi) were the effects positive. In this proposal, by aligning the street along the railway tracks it was possible to connect Radionmäki park directly to the new residential blocks. The option provided in the competition programme to treat Mannerheiminkatu street as an urban street was taken up by very few of the proposals.

Tower block building in line with the spirit of the times was presented in only a few proposals. These comprised high-rise building as a single building, or a few or several buildings. It would seem that the most natural place for possible landmark buildings would be the eastern or southern part of the competition area. Also a landmark over Vesijärvenkatu street was considered an interesting albeit expensive solution.

In most of the proposals the entire competition area was evenly developed. In some proposals the core point was frustratingly loosely and inefficiently solved. A (design) hotel was seen as a good idea for complementing the functions of the station. Extending housing into the vicinity of the station, and consequently supporting the vibrancy of the urban space, was also seen as positive. In a few proposals the emphasis in building was clearly on the east end of the track side and correspondingly the west side had been left more like a park area. In this way a visual and functional connection to Radiomäki hill was sought. Leaving it completely unbuilt was seen as a mistake, but allowing building to become sparser towards the west seemed a good idea with regard to the overall landscape.

The solutions in the best proposals as a rule made possible a staggered implementation. Overly large tower blocks or megastructures were regarded as mistakes from the point of view of feasibility and staggered implementation. Also real estate formation and plot division as a basic factor in urban planning was in some proposals forgotten. The result was disorganised solutions with regard to their spatial hierarchy, traffic solutions, and cityscape. Solutions where the potential for a plausible plot subdivision and clear spatial hierarchy and traffic network could be discerned were considered good. From the point of view of staggered implementation, it was also seen as good that areas indicated for housing contained different types of housing.

The functionally compact realisation of the Travel Centre complex, which had been set as a competition objective, turned out to be the most difficult aspect of the competition. This is understandable because the traffic centre is located in a very challenging area with regards to traffic, the present environment (RKY area) and topography. The jury considered it primarily positive that the competitors aimed to solve the design of the Travel Centre in a way that was novel and different from the alternatives presented in the appendix material, even though the proposed completely new solutions failed because they were too expensive, or problematic due to traffic, cityscape or antiquarian aspects.

It was hoped that through the competition solutions supporting sustainable and ecological lifestyles and Lahti's Green City strategy would be obtained. Many competitors did indeed outline different objectives and solutions in their explanatory text but the written objectives were not always successfully brought all the way to land use or draft plans for buildings or it had been done at a very superficial level. Among the best competition proposals, however, different solutions supporting sustainability and an ecological lifestyle had been presented successfully with inspiration and expertise.

The competition showed that it is possible to successfully build and emphasise by very diverse means the area identity of the Radanvarsi track side. For example, the urban proposal "Four Quarter Strip" and the greener-than-green proposal "Krokotiilli" both presented a strong and unique yet very differing area identity. What was considered a mistake by the jury in regard to area identity was monotonous,

large-scale or overly high building, which from the pedestrian point of view produces disorganised urban spaces. What was also not considered desirable from the point of view of area identity, was when the view from the railway track consisted of wall-like car-parking garage masses or when the area had been solved in a functionally monotonous way (for example, with mainly housing or public functions). Also citizen feedback highlighted functional diversity, happiness and colourfulness as desirable premises for area identity.

Also solutions supporting a “mobility culture” independent of cars, public transport and pedestrian and bicycle traffic were the focus of attention in many of the proposals. In most of them several new transversal connections over or under the railway tracks were indicated. In the best proposals the connections had a logical continuation on both sides of the track. Tunnel solutions were as a rule more successful and user-friendly than overpass bridges which, due to the electricity lines of the railway tracks, would have to be built very high above the ground, which would increase their length and the barrier effect. A clear pedestrian and bicycle route in the direction of the railway tracks, as well as bicycle parking in connection with the station, were considered good solutions by the jury. In some proposals the tall and difficult to access Radiomäki hill had been made part of pedestrian and bicycle traffic network, thus improving its accessibility for recreational use.

In some proposals generating ideas for innovative green concepts had led to excessive green areas and too little building. The best proposals included functionally versatile green areas and city parks that were excellently located in the urban structure. Green building had in some proposals also been skilfully used as part of the buildings, in the form of green roofs and green walls. The functionality of these solutions, however, requires more development and investigation in the further planning regarding winter conditions. Building orientation should also be examined in greater detail in the further planning, if solar energy is to be utilised.

There were numerous options for improving the existing environment in the competition area. Particularly the former industrial buildings had inspired the competitors to develop different solutions for their reuse. The area of the Asko and Upo factories had most often been indicated as a “cultural factory” (cf. the Cable Factory in Helsinki). It was proposed to complement the area with many different kinds of new buildings: housing, cultural and work places, buildings for special events, sport and entertainment, as well as parks and “events piazzas”. Versatile solutions, where the scale of new building adapted to the existing situation, were considered the best. Connecting the courtyards as part of the route network of pedestrian and bicycle traffic was also seen as interesting: this could be a natural opportunity to bring the industrial history of the area within the reach of the citizens. The majority of the competitors had resolved the Asko III area by focusing on housing. The proposals contained solutions with a focus on both low-rise and high-rise housing based on different residential building types. The best proposals were considered those where the proposed housing was diverse and the area was interlinked naturally as part of the surrounding areas, either by complementing the scale of Anttilanmäki or by offering a suitable counter part to it. In some proposals there were also different kinds of re-use indicated (for instance, a shopping mall, student housing, and roof cultivation) in completely or partly preserved factory buildings.

In the best proposals the historical building stock (for instance, the station and stationmaster’s house) and the spacious view of the railway tracks had been interwoven as part of the totality, while at the same time complemented with a new temporal layer. The historical stages and earlier uses of the competition area had occasionally been used as a thematic inspiration, for example in the design of the parks, even to the extent that it prevented the comprehensive development of the area. The objective to preserve as much of the existing building stock as possible had also led to difficulties in fitting in new buildings in the core of the area. The desired functional and spatial densification remained in this case unrealised. On the other hand, in some cases history had not been considered sufficiently and also protected buildings had been indicated for demolition, or there were even proposals for moving Mannerheimipuisto park and its statues elsewhere.



Views generated by the extensive citizen participation, which was part of the Radanvarsi trackside competition project, had been used extensively in the different proposals. As examples, a kindergarten, skateboard park and dog park can be mentioned. It was also exciting and educational to discover that the feedback on the competition proposals provided by the citizens was mainly similar to the jury's own assessments.

### **3. Evaluation of the individual competition proposals**

#### Upper class

##### **1 Four Quarter Strip**

A unique and fresh proposal based on a comprehensive urban approach consisting of four sub-areas, each with a distinct character. The main idea of the proposal is a clearly demarcated sheltered pedestrian route, Salpausselkä Edge, which follows the direction of the railway tracks, meandering through the different sub-areas. In the most western part of the area is the park-like Westend Park, where the focus is on housing, while at the narrowest point of the competition area is the Radanvarsi Strip containing a mixture of functions, for instance, a business centre hotel aimed at start-up companies. At the core of the competition area is Downtown Lahti, with housing and office and commercial buildings. The Travel Centre has been placed underground, beneath the railways tracks. The solution is compact but expensive. Existing buildings have been successfully preserved as part of new constructions and in parallel with them.

The railway station square, which extends towards the Mannerheiminpuisto park, has a clear layout. The bicycle parking centre is centrally located. Preserving the post and customs buildings is surprising: these could well have been replaced with a similar structure as that east of the railway square. A design hotel has been proposed south of the railway tracks, which would naturally continue the city centre functions of the north side on the other side of the tracks. On the eastern-most side is a beautiful area of infill-building, the Asko design district, comprising different enterprises and cultural functions.

The industrial buildings of the Asko III area have been partly indicated for commercial functions, but the car-parking solutions have been only schematically presented. Also low-rise building has been placed in the area (Asko Garden City). The basic building typology is formed by a narrower spatial layout of residential and office buildings placed on a deep-framed plinth, comprising commercial functions and car-parking facilities. Building construction is throughout based on 2-5 storey masses, and thus is well suited to the larger landscape. The scale of the urban spaces is in a successful way compactly urban and creates a unique identity for the area. One could indeed interpret the ecology aspect as being based specifically on its compactness, and not much effort has been put into ideas for green building; for example, the proposal does not show any suggestions for the treatment of storm water. The two sides of the railway tracks have been successfully linked together. There are as many as eight underpasses going under the tracks and some of them could even be removed. The proposal makes a staggered implementation possible and has a lot of potential for further development. All in all, the proposal is highly professionally drawn up. The illustrations are impressive.

##### **3 Krokotiili**

An innovative, visionary and bold proposal which strives to highlight and support the construction of the image of Lahti as a green city. The main concept and objective of the proposal is the responsive ecology (flexibility) of the proposed solutions. The objective has implemented comprehensively in the proposed solution. The land use proposal is based on the rhythmic alternation of built-up and park-like areas.

Construction can be implemented in stages. The city blocks comprise diverse typologies. The number and placement of the taller terraced buildings would require further consideration; presently, with their small windmills, they create unnecessary restlessness in the larger landscape and RKY area. In the western part are self-reliant communal blocks with allotment gardens (“tooth blocks”), and taller residential blocks with side access galleries and construction in wood (“boulder blocks”), the placement of which in the area affected by vibrations from the trains will probably lead to the choice of a different material for the building frame during the further planning stage.

This problem does not exist further away from the tracks, and indeed wood construction is well suited for the image of the green city. Differences in height in the competition area, particularly in this sub-area, have been utilised structurally in the design of car-parking facilities. The car-parking decks of the residential blocks have been placed so that at least half of the yard areas remain outside of them, which enables the implementation of green yards. A part of the proposed residential blocks are rather cramped and their dimensions would require adjustments during the further planning stage. The railway station area has been developed successfully both spatially and functionally. The solution would enable also the integration of the express cargo building, which now has been proposed for demolition, into the new large block. The Travel Centre has been designed in accordance with VE 1 (Alternative 1) in the appendix material, that is, below ground, but its car-parking facilities are placed only on the south side. The office block south of the railway track is well laid out, as are the areas of HTC blocks and “crocodile blocks” north of the tracks. The idea of transforming the Asko and Upo factory areas into an “action factory” and general stores is a natural fit.

The urban context of the Asko III area, built around the central park, continues in a very successful way the mood and scale of the adjacent Anttilanmäki. Also low-rise building has been indicated for that area. The park laudably collects together the pedestrian and bicycle routes and storm water treatment has also been taken into consideration. The location of the kindergarten at the edge of the park is exemplary. The competition area has an uninterrupted pedestrian and bicycle traffic route that cuts through the whole area. With regard to the larger blocks west of the station, the relationship of the route to the spatial hierarchies of the courtyards is, however, fraught with tension. The underpasses beneath the railway track, which improve the pedestrian and bicycle traffic system, are naturally placed. The pedestrian and bicycle route bridge, which functions as a gate motif, is excellent. The illustrations convey excellently the identity of the area created as well as the joyful and unique character of the urban spaces. Construction along the railway tracks is based on the bold use of green roofs and walls (solar collectors and panels). Their implementation probably still requires further development to take into consideration the winter conditions, as does the orientation and amount of solar panels. The views from the trains during the summer time would be verdant and the earth embankment functions not only as a noise barrier but also as a unifying visual motif towards the train passengers. The proposal is overall carefully and professionally drawn up down to the dimensioning and placement of the bicycle and car-parking solutions. Also the results from the local citizens’ interactive participation process have laudably been taken into consideration.

## **5 Preludi**

The main idea of the proposal is a bold and visionary insight: in the western end Mannerheiminkatu street has been aligned along the track side. Two lanes, however, are insufficient because even as an urban street it is still part of the city centre ring road. Because of the new alignment of Mannerheiminkatu street, Radiomäki hill is now well-suited to become a housing area. With the transfer of the road, the residential blocks gain a new spaciousness and pleasant views. The skilfully drawn illustration also shows how the solution enables a direct connection from the residential plots to the green area as well as a sheltered pedestrian and bicycle connection along the side of the hill. Construction indicated along the track side is in other respects rather wall-like. In the western-most part, a city block with commercial and office premises remains somewhat detached from the rest of the urban structure.

Moving Mannerheiminpuisto park in line with the railway tracks as a continuation of the station square leaves the core area spacious. The clock tower that has been retained as a reminder of the post building is left dangling solitary in the corner of the park. The Travel Centre (including the station functions) has been transferred to the other side of Vesijärvenkatu street and office and restaurant facilities have been placed in the old station building. This solution enables the placement of the Travel Centre in the new residential, commercial and office facilities south of the railway track, and it is rather compact from the point of view of train and bus passengers. The solution is, however, expensive and the walking connection to the city centre is not particularly fluent. The cargo station remains far from the long distance traffic terminal. The extensive deck constructions create challenges for orientation and accessibility. The appearance of both the canopy motif of the Travel Centre and the new pedestrian and bicycle bridges is clumsy.

The proposed emphasis of Salininkatu street as a park axis seems unnecessary because the functional focus has with the Travel Centre moved eastwards. The Asko and Upo factory areas have been developed as places for culture and special events, but not much new construction has been proposed. The public squares are over-dimensioned and the placement of the stage is odd. In the proposal Asko III has been made into an area with an emphasis on multi-storey residential buildings, as a symmetrical counterpart to the Asemantausta area on the other side of Anttilanmäki. The central square linked with the railway underpass is well organised and the play park marks the core of the area. A part of the old industrial halls has been transformed into locations for different activities and events, offices and student housing. The amount of preserved old structures in relation to new building is reasonable. Extensive fields of ground level car-parking, however, do not produce a pleasant view when approaching the area.

## **6 Plug-in City**

The proposal is based on the maximum utilisation of the existing environment and linking in new buildings flexibly, when necessary gradually, and adapting to each prevailing situation. It extends the notion of the linear city by linking different additional parts to long lamellas (plug-ins) as well as by cutting them up and moving them sideways. The proposal contains numerous ideas linked with ecology and image construction. The area is divided into four parts, which makes a staggered implementation easier. In the central parts of the competition area housing as well as commerce, offices and workspaces are mixed together.

The residential blocks on the west side are bordered on the sides of Mannerheiminkatu street and Helsingintie road by lamella blocks, which shelter the lower townhouses and row houses. The courtyard milieu is very small scale. The orientation of the buildings takes well into consideration the cardinal directions but leaves the courtyard exposed to the noise from the railway line. Placed on the railway side of the plot are diverse forms of urban farming and where, for instance, disused railway carriages are utilised as allotment garden cottages. One can really imagine the courtyard being filled with various activities promoting an ecological lifestyle. When looking from Mannerheiminkatu street, the views are rather monotonous. Car-parking has been solved by placing it beneath an oblong deck. The deck solution seems natural, however, as it offers a narrow and meandering terraced route for pedestrian and bicycle traffic, with the wood deck material emphasising humaneness.

Three tall towers have been placed centrally in the area, the most western of which has an unfortunate proximity to the radio masts. Existing buildings have been utilised as community spaces, a youth hostel, atelier and workshop spaces. The totality created by the former post and customs building has been complemented with housing and workspaces. The public square on top of the deck seems promising with regard to its demarcation and layout. The Travel Centre has been solved in an understated way, with the exception of the waiting area above the bus platforms, which is a winter-garden-type glass structure. The solution would be an efficient measure in improving the image of the area, albeit ecologically challenging. The traffic arrangements are somewhat vague; it would seem that the bus traffic from the Travel Centre would pass by Askonkatu street. The placement of the bicycle routes could have been clearer; the illustrations and traffic diagrams are incompatible.

On both sides of the Asko-Upo area the basic typologies continue, where the southern detached building masses join together with the lamella blocks on the north side. In these blocks, too, the functions are mixed. The environment seems at first glance small scale and pleasant but it is difficult to examine it in more detail due to the lack of documentation, and the question arises of whether it is at least partly merely a question of skilful presentation graphics. In the Asko III area the factory halls have been utilised for housing, cultivation, sports and events. Also, several different experimental housing types have been placed in the area, forming an interesting and diverse totality.

The proposal is the only one among the upper class entries where the storm water treatment and water system of the area have been comprehensively considered as a whole. On the other hand, at least the biological purification plant for waste water has been placed too far from the housing and its capacity is very small.

## **8 Ketju**

The authors propose as a solution of enclosed blocks with an often angular building mass, which form greater blocks that are linked together by a pedestrian and bicycle route. The area is in relation to its surroundings rather fully built. The building masses grow taller as one moves westwards towards the Travel Centre and the Asko-Upo area. Between the greater blocks are different kinds of parks and public squares.

Overall, the design is fairly restrained, but still solid, and it has a good spatial and cityscape rhythm. The design of the housing blocks in the western part is professionally done. The angular, long lamella blocks create diverse urban spaces, while sheltering the interiors of the blocks from noise. The parks and public squares establish a pleasant rhythm as one moves through the area. Because the pedestrian and bicycle route goes through the residential block, its implementation would require particular attention.

In the central areas the functions are rather mixed, which indeed helps in creating a living urban environment. This objective is also supported by the compactness of building. The Travel Centre solution is understated, albeit somewhat dull. The glass station restaurant placed between the railway station and its extension raised contradictory opinions among the jury. The landmark-like hotel proposed for the station piazza was seen as a good function within the overall design, but the building was perceived as too tall. The piazza remains somewhat unorganised. Pushing the bus parking through the Stationmaster's park draws power away from an otherwise attractive green area.

The Asko-Upo area, the adjacent park-like piazza and housing block to its east form an impressive composition. A very similar type of block east of Asko might already be too much. The totality could have gained from at least one slightly more extensive public green area. The business and office building complex on the eastern edge remains, at least in the present state of the near surroundings, slightly solitary and to the side. The housing area in place of Asko III forms a skilfully designed totality that combines different housing types and leaves enough free space around it for the placement of urban cultivation and leisure-time activities.

## **22 Siemen**

In the proposal new construction is placed fairly evenly and compactly throughout the competition area, with housing concentrated in the west and east ends. The authors have preserved many of the existing buildings, complementing them with new functions and infill building. The proposal emphasises different angles of sustainable development, and the authors envision how the Radanvarsi city district would become an ecological model of international standard. The proposal is also one of the few that mentions as one of its objectives supporting Lahti local identity and regional pride.

The totality has a pleasant atmosphere, has been comparatively well researched, and has a skilfully controlled scale. The residential blocks in the western part have been implemented as half-enclosed city blocks, the building frame depth of which raised slight doubts among the jury regarding their feasibility.

The car traffic connections beneath the decks of the residential blocks in the west end reach deep into the courtyards, mixing poorly with the pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

Youth and workshop spaces have been placed in the warehouses and other railway buildings of the west end, and in their immediate vicinity is Kiskopuisto park and a skateboard park that utilise the tracks lines that are due to be taken out of use. These form a welcome contrast to the new construction and add a layeredness to the area. The locomotive drivers' building has been converted into a residents' information centre. The totality created by the preserved customs and post building, together with the proposed supermarket and library, is unconvincing, and the central areas remain a collection of parking spaces and disorganised public squares and park areas. The authors do indeed mention the further development potential of this area as functions change.

The design solution for the Travel Centre is understated and timid, yet manages to create a pleasant urban square in front of the railway station and emphasises in the desired way bicycling. The area's internal bicycling routes could, on the other hand, have been shown more clearly. The office deck structure on the east side of the Travel Centre raised contradictory emotions, but it could be a viable solution if carefully implemented. The Asko-Upo area forms a balanced and interesting totality with regards to its functions and massing. The area south of it, dominated by low-rise housing with diverse typologies, is a fresh solution with development potential.

The proposal contains an enormous amount of well-substantiated and carefully considered ideas linked with sustainable development. The explanatory text carefully goes through all the sub-areas of sustainable development and their application for the competition area, starting from solutions for the infrastructure (including a tube transport system for refuse, the maximal utilisation of the existing street network and the treatment of storm water) all the way to the arrangement of an autumn harvest festival that strengthens the identity of the area and the shared spirit of the residents. The proposal also presents the concept of a productive city; the area of the railway tracks is to be a model area where a wide array of different ecosystem services could be produced. Several of the solutions proposed in the text unfortunately do not work in the plans; e.g. a vegetation-based waste-water treatment plant is under-dimensioned and utilising solar energy in compact residential blocks is difficult. Building densely creates challenges also for food production. The proposal is the only one in the upper class where the premise of high-speed bicycle routes has been investigated. Unfortunately in the plans the high-speed bicycle routes often cross over with pedestrian routes and cars turning into courtyards.

## **26 Kiila**

In the proposal the focus of the area has been placed in the east and the western part has been left completely unbuilt. A sculptural bridge crosses the railway tracks at the middle section of Radiomäki hill. The construction carried out in the vicinity of the railway station and west of it has been implemented as a wedge-like compact totality. Particular attention has been paid to the composition of the urban structure and the character of the public urban spaces.

The proposal has focused only on a part of the competition area, but what it has done it has done carefully. The series of public spaces beginning from the railway station is a delightful collection of diverse public squares and routes with different characters. The Travel Centre is placed west of the railway station, which from the point of view of the traffic, is a problematic location. The solution has freed the eastern end of car traffic. The railway square is a small-scale, inviting space from where the "Rambla" continues as a wide pedestrian and bicycle traffic bridge or deck towards the Asko buildings. The illustrations for the proposal are delightful and convey genuinely the urban yet suitably small-scale inner city atmosphere. The massing of the new buildings meanders and respects the ridge landscape as well as the existing buildings. Housing has also been placed in central areas – a solution that supports the vibrancy of the city and which can be found in surprisingly few of the proposals. Resolving Askonkatu street as a pleasant pedestrian- and bicycle-prioritised street that encourages people to enjoy the outdoor space is a challenging task. Largish public

squares have been placed on both sides of Asko-Upo, but can a use be found for both? The “Activities Square” with its skateboard park and proposed temporary activities, which forms an end motif for a series of urban spaces, and which is placed beneath the Uponsilta bridge, adds a pleasant coarseness to the proposal. The Asko III housing area continues the atmosphere of the adjacent low-rise residential area of Anttilanmäki but as a solution it is slightly formulaic.

## Upper middle class

### **2 Laituri**

The proposal relies on the services of the city centre and places mainly housing on the competition area. The trackside is lined with a strip of car-parking garages. The major part of the historical buildings has been demolished. The large city block at the west end frames within it a large park area. The building mass forms an extensive public square on the side of the Mytäjäinen traffic interchange. The building frame depths, particularly close to the interchange, are large. Car access into the parking garage next to the trackside remains unclear; does the courtyard access ramp lead into the garage? The authors suggest placing a pedestrian and bicycle bridge at roughly the middle of Radiomäki hill as well as a tunnel leading into the ridge, but it is not clear from the submitted material where the tunnel leads. The point blocks aligned in a chain along Mannerheiminkatu street were considered a solution with development potential.

The station square forms a pleasant totality together with the Mannerheiminaukio square. Facilities for bicycle parking have been indicated in connection with the Travel Centre. The stationmaster’s house and park remain squeezed in between Uudenmaankatu street, the bus platform area and new construction. The Asko-Upo area has been complemented with housing, commercial premises and car-parking facilities. The public square in the middle of these is disorganised and unreasonably large in scale. A bastion-like large urban block has been developed for the Asko area in which lamella blocks offering protection from traffic noise surround taller point blocks. The park spaces left between these would have gained from some kind of hierarchical structure; now they are very similar in both size and character.

### **12 Green-go**

The proposal places a rather small amount of buildings in the competition area and is strongly focused on green and recreational areas. The authors consider that investing in routes surrounded by parks and greenery encourages the users of the area to walk and bicycle. The plan contains numerous ideas for green building and ecology. The major part of the existing buildings has been preserved. The areas along the track side are protected by green noise barriers built from boxes suitable for plants.

Generally, the contrast in the proposal between, on the one hand, the extensive park areas and empty spaces and, on the other hand, the compactly built areas is interesting, but all pieces do not fit into place and the totality remains in places clumsy. The idea of reserving the entire west end of the area for a park did not convince the jury, particularly when a reservation for a large green area has also been made in the east. The green corridor east of the Travel Centre leading to the city centre was seen as a good idea with development potential. The green areas also create pleasant views when looking from the tracks.

The post and customs buildings have been preserved and they are complemented with offices and a cargo terminal. The character and traffic arrangements of the yards of these buildings remain vague. The authors have created a symmetrical motif of the bus platforms, which is in dialogue with the water basin motif designed for the other side of Mannerheiminkatu street. The central composition is supported by an awning placed on top of the bus platforms, the precise character of which remains unclear. Converting Mannerheiminkatu street into a more pedestrian-oriented street, as the authors have suggested, may be difficult to implement when combining it with the traffic for the Travel Centre. Three storeys of car-parking

have been placed under the Travel Centre. The railway administration building planned for the area east of the Travel Centre is as a building mass over-dimensioned, at least for the proposed use. The one-storey bicycle park on the east side takes up an unnecessarily large slice of the courtyard area of the Stationmaster's house, and both from a cityscape point of view and functionally it is located on an unnecessarily valuable location.

The area east of Asko-Upo, the "Postindustrial Machine", has been reserved for office buildings and is very compact indeed. In the Asko III area there is an experimental area of ecological building based on a grid, where built and unbuilt areas systematically interchange. The idea is to utilise in the new buildings structures taken from the dismantled factory buildings. The area is divided into zones: rows of greenhouses offer protection from traffic noise, and this zone is followed by zones reserved for cultivation, housing, rainwater collection and recreation. Different zones form diverse and multifaceted environments, as long as the area is not too spread out.

#### **14 JESJ**

A distinct proposal which concentrates construction in the east part of the area, leaving the west end as a park, with the exception of the Starkki area which is outside the competition area. The proposal divides the area clearly into parts reserved for different functions: park, Travel Centre, commercial services, cultural functions and housing. The form language is on the one hand organically adaptive yet on the other hand diverse and angular.

The park at the west end of the competition area consists of an extensive grass field, train carriages converted into restaurants and shops, an outdoor theatre and a skateboard park. The design of the park remains somewhat unfinished; for example, placing an amphitheatre against its natural direction on the slope does not work, and as the park narrows on approaching the Travel Centre individual info and restaurant buildings do not seem sufficient for creating an interesting exterior space. Also leaving the entire west end of the competition area unbuilt was seen as problematic.

The design of the Travel Centre has been solved with a large undulating roof structure which functions as a self-supporting bridge over Vesijärvenkatu street. The roof is oriented towards the centre and turns its back on the railway station, but at the same time demarcates car traffic on its front side and leaves behind it a natural sheltered space for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The roof creates a strong landmark-like element as an end point for Vesijärvenkatu street and creates an identity for the Travel Centre that it sorely lacks. Unfortunately the authors have not been able to make up their minds whether the awning is built as a green roof or a bare steel construction; the submitted material is contradictory on this issue.

The commercial area east of the Travel Centre is spatially interesting but probably functionally over-dimensioned. Also the area's service traffic from the trackside is problematic. The authors have many good ideas for functions regarding the Asko-Upo area: guest ateliers, a furniture museum, and functions linked with fitness and gastronomy. The public square east of the buildings remains somewhat undefined.

The entire Asko III area has been treated as a kind of housing fair area: the authors suggest that the city invites into the area different architects to present the latest trends in sustainable development. The aerial illustration of the area is delightful and diverse.

#### **19 Notko**

The overall idea of the proposal is to produce a functionally mixed and compact built area to complement the Lahti city centre. The premise is good and the implementation is presented in a balanced way. The main idea is to move Mannerheiminkatu street southwards. The solution leaves the residential buildings north of the new street line without sheltered yards and correspondingly construction along the side of the railway tracks is crammed in on narrow plots left between the street and railway tracks. Perceiving the new character of Mannerheiminkatu street as an urban street is, nevertheless, very insightful. The traffic has

been slowed down and small urban piazzas are demarcated along it. A fluent and clear pedestrian and bicycle route has been indicated in this area following the direction of the tracks, which attempts to collect the central functions along it.

The route is, however, drawn up on the track side and remains somewhat one-sided with regards to its functional energy. The idea of a green wall along the track side is interesting and there could have been more visuals (e.g. an illustration) showing its implementation. The existing historical buildings have been well taken into consideration, and the scale of building is well suited to Lahti, albeit the cityscape and its spaces in places lose their rhythm. The railway station square in particular remains spatially undefined. The Travel Centre has been credibly designed. The city block opposite the railway station comprising two car-parking garages is well functioning.

Otherwise, too, the design solutions for traffic, land use and staggered implementation have been well studied and presented extensively through diagrams. The area of the Asko and Upo factories has been complemented with versatile residential and workplace buildings. The layouts of the residential blocks of Asko III and the traffic network are somewhat uncertain, albeit the low-rise blocks seem promising. The 4-6 storey lamella houses of the outer perimeter have an unrealistically deep building frame or correspondingly produce dark apartments. It can be seen as a shortcoming that there are no specific ideas in the proposal for urban planning that support a sustainable and ecological lifestyle.

## **18 IXIXI**

The proposal takes as its starting point linking together the Lahti city centre and the southern city districts with strongly articulated pedestrian and bicycle routes. At the same time, the routes that cross the tracks diagonally create a mark in the urban space that constructs an identity and symbolises the focuses of the city (i.e. the favouring of pedestrian and bicycle traffic). Also the layout of the building masses follows the directions of these routes. The proposal is sculptural, the massing is well controlled, and it takes a relatively comprehensive approach to the whole competition area. Also construction has been placed in areas outside the actual competition area. Housing and workplace areas have in the proposal been differentiated fairly clearly from each other. The alignment of Mannerheiminkatu street has been redrawn, which enables placing terraced houses directly on the side of the hill.

Unfortunately many of the ideas of the proposal rely solely on the explanatory text; for example, the bridge-like pedestrian connection to the top of Radiomäki hill, the surroundings of the Travel Centre and the awning connected to it, as well as the actual character of the urban space created by means of the new city block parks and vistas. Also the transformation of Mannerheiminkatu street into a unique urban street, as mentioned by the authors, can only be guessed at, as in the illustrations the street appears as a highway-like route. The massive towers, in places 20 storeys high, placed west of the Travel Centre, clearly rise above the ridge and form a significant feature in the cityscape. The Travel Centre does not create a unity but remains a collection comprised of the railway station, the bus platform area, and the towers west of it. The emphasis of the proposal in the fluency of the traffic has partly been counter-productive in creating monotonous, disorganised urban space. Also the pedestrian and bicycle routes crossing the tracks, while in themselves interesting, were perceived as unnecessarily long and in the prevailing climatic conditions unfortunately often unpleasant to cross.

## Lower middle class

### **7 Tune in City**

The overall idea of the proposal is based on the development of the competition area as a location for different types of housing solutions, versatile services and workplace areas. In the explanatory text, the



described objectives and proposed land use solutions correspond to each other but the chosen way of building and the scale produce an inconsistent and coarse environment. The meandering housing blocks recessed from the street line do not support the urban feel of Mannerheiminkatu street but rather underline its highway-like character. The spatial hierarchy of their immediate surroundings is out of balance: the borderlines between the private, semi-public and public are difficult to distinguish. Also the core areas remain fairly vague. The station square has, however, been successfully demarcated and the pedestrian and bicycle connection following the direction of the railway tracks is clear. The “bus aquarium” as a concept is amusing, but its overall mass is like a hangar and the proposed traffic connection does not work.

The tunnel that leads from the city centre to the Asemantausta park and back is, due to the expansion of the deck construction, dark and unnecessarily long. The stick-like residential blocks proposed for the eastern area, which are placed transversally above the commercial premises, are interesting as a typological experiment but do not fit in their location. A “cultural factory” has been proposed for re-using the Asko-Upo factory area. A large arena has been proposed as a new function, but with regard to the flow of people it remains too far from the Travel Centre. A mixed area of housing and business enterprises proposed for the Asko III area is interesting as an idea but challenging when it comes to implementation. A fun detail in the proposal is a bridge and cable car from the family park towards the Radiomäki hill across the railway tracks.

## **9 Reipas**

The objective of the proposal is to densify and extend the present city structure. The overall idea is fresh and the starting point straight forward, but in its presentation the overall impression remains somewhat lacklustre. The rhythm and scale of building is mostly appropriate for the location. The core of the competition area is spatially and functionally disjointed. The railway station has been converted into a cultural centre and its present functions are moved to the new Travel Centre situated on the east side of Vesijärvenkatu street. The Travel Centre is difficult to reach by foot from the direction of the city centre and also the spatial continuity of the urban structure is disrupted at that point.

It is proposed that the Asko and Upo factories be re-used as a centre for wood construction and design, as well as a congress centre. Also continuing from there is an area of (residential?) blocks. An area of wooden multi-storey housing has been placed on the Asko III area, which could indeed have some influence on Lahti’s Green City image. The presented solution is, however, formulaic and inflexible. The presentation is somewhat schematic and, for example, in the general plan the uses and floor heights of the buildings remain partly ambiguous. The authors have unnecessarily put effort into designing areas outside the competition area at the cost of the design solutions for the competition area itself.

## **11 Monocle**

The comprehensive solution is based on free-form building consisting of large units, which enables leaving large green areas in between them. The authors’ striving for sculpturality turns against itself; the wall-like building masses with green areas in between do not form a pleasant urban structure and cityscape at the pedestrian scale. The aimed for functional density with different activities becomes diluted into windswept in-between areas. For example, the café building at the narrowest point of the competition area receives no support from other activities, nor is it located at the peak point in regard to the landscape, something which would motivate the placement of such a solution. The greenness of the “activity area” is also a challenge, in that beneath it is an extensive building structure for car-parking facilities. The views from the railways track are, however, green due to the plant-filled embankment. A swimming hall has been proposed in the vicinity of the railway station.

A pedestrian and bicycle route, which provides an easy orientation, leads through the western and central parts of the area, though it is cut off in the eastern part. The new underpass beneath the tracks in the west

is well situated. The Travel Centre has been solved by placing it underground, and above it is a shopping-centre-type node, which also includes a cinema. Vesijärvenkatu street has been roofed over. The extension of the railway square made possible by the deck solution is spatially inflexible. The connection from the underground bus terminal to the station building requires people to ascend and then cross the square (or to take a detour via the train platforms). Cultural activities and shops have been indicated for the area of the Asko and Upo factories, as has a skateboard park wished by the residents.

The spiral-like car-parking garage has a needlessly in-your-face design. The scale of the residential blocks in both the west and east ends becomes unnecessarily pompous. Different housing types have been placed in the Asko III area, something which can be seen as positive, but the design of the low-rise blocks is due to the geometrically oblique motifs in places unnecessarily inflexible. The authors have not particularly come up with ideas that support an ecological and sustainable lifestyle. The protected buildings have been adequately taken into consideration. The proposal comes up with fanciful ideas for the re-use of railcars as part of the local transport. The presentation is distinct.

## **16 Jääjärven hedelmät**

The proposal is based on an imaginary story in which the Ice Age has left small round tower-like objects, the so-called "Fruits of the ice lake", to grow moss at the foot of the Salpausselkä ridge. The authors have spread these out as a basic typology throughout the entire competition area. Mannerheimintie street has been realigned, old blocks have been complemented with new infill buildings and a ferris wheel has been placed on Radiomäki hill.

Even though the cylinder-like objects that resembles hand grenades certainly would create a strong and unique identity for the area, resolving the entire competition area with a single typology would nevertheless be a demanding task. Of course the authors have also used more rectangular masses, the particular characteristics of which, however, are left undefined. Moving Mannerheiminkatu street into the centre of the western end of the area narrows the building area in a way that removes the advantages that the realignment has brought. The authors have preserved the post and customs buildings and extended them, but they have missed the opportunity to create interesting urban space. The solution for the Travel Centre is formulaic, but the proposed wooden roofing over the bus platforms is elegant and beautifully highlights the station square. The ferris wheel proposed adjacent to the radio masts takes dominance away from the masts themselves. The re-use of the factory halls of Asko III as a winter city by opening up internal streets in the buildings and placing there various uses is an interesting idea but requires more careful planning so that the totality, including the exterior spaces, would create an interesting environment.

## **17 Cardo**

A proposal in which the authors are more interested in the design of the external study area and other areas than working on the actual competition area. The inner city blocks have been renewed and there is also strong infill building in the Asematausta area south of the railway tracks. The actual design solutions for the competition area remain sketchy and the attraction of the area does not improve with the suggested solutions. The connection of the pedestrian and bicycle route, which is a continuation of Rautatienkatu street, to the other side of the railway tracks is a good insight. The transversal connection is indeed based on the idea referenced by the proposal's pseudonym, "Cardo", of a connection across the railway tracks which lines up the church, square, city hall, Travel Centre and Laune family park.

The pedestrian and bicycle connections in the direction of the railway track have, however, not been indicated. The boulder-like Travel Centre building has been placed west of the present railway station. It remains solitary in its location and receives no support from either other functions or the general cityscape. The traffic solutions have been sketchily presented. The public exterior spaces thus created are overly large, desolate and unorganised. The massive car-parking garages along the railway tracks do not present a positive image of Lahti when viewed from the train. On the other hand, the green roofs and proposed parks

accentuate the view. Complementing the Asko-Upo factory areas with a wall-like mass is not convincing. The finger-like urban structure of Asko III is forceful and has potential for further development. There are no specific ideas in the proposal for urban planning that support sustainable and ecological lifestyles.

### **23 Lahti Cycle**

A grandiloquent proposal in which a sculptural office tower block that takes its inspiration from the profile of a ski jump tower has been proposed for the eastern part of the competition area. When considering feasibility, its scale, however, is too big for Lahti, even though it does in a way function as a built counterpart in the overall landscape to Radiomäki hill. The objectives set in the explanatory text are building an ecological city and a variety of ideas for design solutions and innovative green concepts have been generated for a sustainable and ecological lifestyle. The proposed design solutions, however, do not entirely support the concretisation of the written objectives. The text, for instance, emphasises wood construction and taking the roofs into productive use (e.g. urban cultivation) but the tower conglomeration in the east part does not enable the plausible implementation of such objectives.

Also the airy perspective illustration, with its reflections, gives the impression of a union between glass and steel. The other perspectives, too, are illustrative and show the key parts of the design solution. A swimming hall and spa are placed in the west part, in connection with which is an exciting green deck-like overpass over the railway tracks and Mannerheiminkatu street towards Radiomäki hill. A clearly outlined longitudinal pedestrian connection has been indicated for the competition area, along which mixed functions have been proposed. Mannerheiminkatu street has partly been covered with a deck construction, which can be seen as a good idea in reducing the barrier effect of the street, but not much building has been indicated on top of it. The core area adjacent to the railway station is left very open and spacious. The public exterior spaces proposed for it are overly large and shapeless. The design of the Travel Centre has been solved as a wooden bridge-like structure that stretches across the tracks. The organisation of the bus traffic has not been shown. Housing has been indicated for the Asko III area. The solution for its land use is formulaic and cursorily presented.

## Lower Class

### **4 Kajo**

The authors have placed housing at the west and east ends of the competition area in very large-scale units. The Travel Centre is designed as a complex of four buildings linked by pedestrian bridges. An “events square” is proposed for the east end of the Travel Centre over a parking deck which is lined by cubic buildings for commercial and office facilities. The authors have preserved many of the old buildings of the area.

On the whole, the scale of the proposal has gotten out of hand. At the west end the large enclosed blocks and serpentine lamella mass that is a continuation of these do not connect with their surroundings. The elevated “events square” is enormous in scale. The monolithic shape of the Travel Centre, with its overpasses, creates around it glum urban space. The pedestrian and bicycle network does not create unified routes. Interesting and mutually supporting functions have been proposed for the Asko-Upo area: a skateboard park, artists’ residences, student housing and different cultural activities. The triangular-shaped building masses placed west of the Asko building complex could be feasible. The residential area that replaces the Asko III buildings consists of buildings with oddly varying building frame depths and the massing does not form a cohesive whole. The kindergarten located in the block is over-dimensioned.

## **10 Aurinko-Lahti**

The authors envision the railway track area as a place that brings together a new kind of green urbanism, design, fitness and well-being as well as civic activities. They propose a traffic concept that supports pedestrian and bicycle traffic as well as the use of electric vehicles. The massing is fairly moderate and the residential blocks are based on an enclosed block typology.

Overall, the proposal remains sketchy and inconsistent. The documents are incomplete; for example, the floor heights of the buildings are only partly indicated. The alignment of the pedestrian and bicycle route, the "Paana", which the authors emphasise is essential, has been rather cursorily presented. It is only visible in the traffic diagrams. Moving the main road south of the tracks in the central areas did not convince the jury. Also many other interesting ideas are merely mentioned in the explanatory text. The layout of the Asko III area is formulaic, even harsh, and the shoreline café marked in the area raises consternation. The green area with a baroque park layout, which descends from Radiomäki hill towards the "Hotel Starck", is surprising but if carefully implemented could be an invigorating element in the cityscape. The rich experiential and interactive world that the authors envision would probably not be realised with the proposed buildings in the warehouse area; the urban spaces remain monotonous and repetitive. The Travel Centre is well functioning but does not add anything particularly interesting.

## **13 Uudet polut**

A proposal that [in accordance with its pseudonym meaning "new paths"] literally lays out new paths, where the traffic of Mannerheiminkatu street at the point of the railway station has been brought closer to the centre along Loviisankatu street and Salininkatu street. The urban space has been freed to create a "Welcome piazza" and outdoor theatre in front of the station. The outdoor theatre pushes awkwardly in front of the railway station building. The Travel Centre has been located beneath Mannerheiminaukio square. The location of the core area cannot be considered successful in regard to traffic. Another main idea is the lagoon park placed in the west part of the area, which perhaps draws its inspiration from an English landscape park. The solution is challenging with regard to, for instance, the control of the water conditions.

The proposed amount of new building is comparatively small and inflexible with regard to massing, and is not sufficient to make the area vibrant and attractive. The car-parking garages dominate the track view. The "ice bridges" crossing the track are an inventive idea, albeit their functionality for bicycling seems problematic (i.e. the lift and staircase at the other end). The pedestrian and bicycle connection, following the direction of the rail tracks, is not fluent at the very core of the area. Facilities for ecological enterprises have been reserved in the area of the Asko and Upo factories, where also housing for an ecological community is placed. The re-use and part dismantling of the buildings in the Asko III area remains a sketchy solution. The proposal is formulaically presented and, for instance, the floor heights of the buildings are not indicated.

## **15 Kätetty puutarha**

The comprehensive idea of the proposal is based on linking the competition area to the centre of Lahti via a cultural strip consisting of different cultural buildings. A second major idea is pushing Mannerheiminkatu street underneath the railway station square. The potential that this solution brings has, however, not been thoroughly studied, and the proposed city block remains spatially disjointed and repeats the former street line. Solving the street crossing between the heavily trafficked Mannerheiminkatu street and Vesijärvenkatu street as well as the access to the cargo, long distance and local traffic terminals as an underground roundabout has not been presented in more detail, even though it is of central importance to the functionality and viability of the design solution.

The design focuses on the areas north of the track. The role of the competition area as an area that links together both sides of the track has thus not been emphasised. The presentation, which is rather sketchy and hurried, adds to the difficulty in interpreting the proposal. Also the documents contradict each other and have pieces missing, particularly with regard to the design solutions for the Asko III area which has not been presented. The hand-drawn pictures aptly depict the ambience of the different squares and urban locations. The explanatory text has been fluently written and the principles presented therein for urban development and building could produce a vibrant urban environment. The physical appearance, however, of the comprehensive solution remains hidden.

## **20 Tulipyörä**

The proposal places comparatively little building in the competition area. It gives space to Radiomäki hill by leaving a large part of its northern side as a green area, with a focus on environmental art. The west and east ends of the competition area have been reserved for housing. Special housing has been placed west of the Travel Centre, but otherwise the central areas are for office and commercial use. The authors emphasise long vistas, piazzas and urban parks.

The proposal remains, however, rather clumsy in regard to its treatment of urban space. An abundance of piazzas, for instance the “events piazza” of Askonkatu street, and a large part of the squares of the residential areas are over-dimensioned. The Travel Centre has been placed east of the Stationmaster’s house, in which case also the potentially busiest area, the railway station square, remains stunted. The residential blocks east of Uudenmankatu street and north of the railway tracks seem promising. At the east end of the area, the Asko III area, the building masses naturally become lower towards Anttilanmäki, but there, too, the urban space disintegrates into a collection of numerous parks and squares of a similar scale. Also the car-parking garages lining the residential blocks were perceived as problematic with regards to views. The blocks placed north of the tracks, adjacent to Asko, seemed a promising area for housing, but in the land use diagrams it has been marked as an area of city centre functions. The real character of the light/sound park and formal garden complex placed between Mytjäinen and the Travel Centre remains a mystery and finding the info/exhibition space amidst this complex could, at least for tourists, prove challenging.

## **21 Orient Express**

A proposal in which the main attention is taken by a multi-purpose building stretching across the railway tracks, massive in scale and resembling a perplexing snail. Its proposed functions include a school. Also in the east part of the area is a bridge-like building crossing the railway tracks. The main building emphasis is offices, commerce and public buildings. Housing has only been indicated south of the railway tracks. The strongest feature of the proposal is the diverse generation of ideas for different functions (e.g. utilising temporary functions as a part of the development of the area, and a delicacies market selling local produce) and a design approach that emphasises user-centeredness. The resulting cityscape, however, is not attractive and remains also spatially disorganised. The Asko and Upo factory areas have been indicated for cultural use regarding both the re-use of the existing buildings and new buildings.

The large block structure proposed for the Asko III area has development potential. The bridge “serpentine” at the foot of Radiomäki hill that takes a detour via the roof adds unnecessarily walking distance for the pedestrians. At this point no overpass or underpass for pedestrian and bicycle traffic has been shown that would continue the serpentine route. The general plan of the proposal is cursorily presented: for example, the heights and uses of the different buildings remain partly to be guessed at. The same veil of mystery covers the design solution for the Travel Centre. The idea of the user profiles that the author has come up with are fun, but do not make up for the shortcomings in the overall design.

## **24 Pölkylt**

The proposal offers a solution for the area by building relatively little but large. Almost all existing buildings have been preserved and they have undergone few or no changes. The Travel Centre terminals are located underground, and access to them is via the realigned Askonkatu street. The proposal introduces three new pedestrian and bicycle connections over the railroad tracks as well as an east-west oriented route.

The proposed building masses do not convince the jury that the solution would create a vibrant city. The blocks are huge in scale and without any relationship to their surroundings. The connection of the large blocks at the west end to the traffic network and the streets brought into the internal courtyards are confusing solutions. The placement of the Travel Centre in the way the authors have suggested, beneath a deck structure, would in practice destroy the park of the Stationmaster's house. The front of the railway station, an important point in the city structure, is left untreated. The Asko II area has been left unchanged. The proposal's most interesting aspect is the Asko III area, where the industrial buildings have been modified by cutting paths and light wells in to them and various functions have been proposed for the spaces. The proposal lacks an explanatory text.

## **25 Bridge**

A proposal representing a psychedelic urban vision without a credible overall concept. The presented construction is based on a building typology that resembles a bowl-like spaceship. The assigned functions are mainly commercial and public (such as a bookstore, café, hotel), and housing is not shown at all. Also, a corresponding organic design language has been used in the refurbishment and infill building of the existing building stock. The result is anti-urban and fragmented urban structure, where the distances between the various activities are unnecessarily long. The Kalevala and the topology mentioned in the explanatory text as starting points are not concretised in the presented solution, nor is the created regional identity attractive.

The design of the Travel Centre complex is resolved as a free-form bridge-like mass, which extends, as several stories high, across the tracks from the front of the railway station. The idea outlined in the explanatory text of a functional node at the station is a good one, even if the solutions presented are in regard to scale and form language inappropriate for the location. Several new pedestrian and bicycle connections across the railway tracks have been presented, which lead on to bridges that are in the form of ski tubes. The proposal does not present in detail solutions for a sustainable and ecological way of life, nor does it present any innovative green concepts. The solution does not take into account or develop the values or scale of the existing building stock. The proposal is, furthermore, difficult to decipher.

# **4. Competition results**

## **The competition results**

After having familiarised themselves with the competition proposals, the jury decided to divide the entries into three classes as follows: Upper Class (7 proposals), Higher and Lower Middle Class (in total 11 proposals) and Lower Class (8 proposals)

The proposals lifted from the Upper Class to the prize-winning category are mainly of two types: those where the authors had been able to respond, comprehensively and showing great vision, to the objectives set in the competition task, and those in which a particular sub-area had been resolved particularly meritoriously. The very best proposals offered different views for the development of the

competition area, and in addition complemented one another, and thus can be seen to offer a diverse basis for future planning.

The jury unanimously decided to award prizes and purchases to the following proposals. The purchases have not been placed in order of merit.

1st prize	Entry no. 3, pseudonym 36 000 Euros	"Krokotiili"
2nd prize	Entry no. 8, pseudonym 27 000 Euros	"Ketju"
3rd prize	Entry no. 1, pseudonym 18 000 Euros	"Four Quarter strip"
Purchase	Entry no. 22, pseudonym 9 000 Euros	"Siemen"
Purchase	Entry no. 5, pseudonym 9 000 Euros	"preludi"
Honourable mention	Entry no. 6, pseudonym	"Plug-in City"

## 5. Recommendations for further planning

As in land use ideas competitions in general, not a single proposal corresponded fully with all the competition objectives. In the further planning process, the strengths offered by the prize-winning and purchased proposals should indeed be utilised in the planning of the competition area. The jury also recommends that when possible work should be done in cooperation with the authors of the prize-winning and purchased proposals when designing the different sub-areas. Additionally, the extensive experiment in citizen participation held in connection with the competition, as well as its results, establish a good basis for the further implementation of participatory urban planning and interaction during the whole process.

## 6. Signing the jury report

Lahti, 14.12.2012

Jyrki Myllyvirta, Chairman of the jury

Timo Ahonen

Jorma Vaskelainen

Veli-Pekka Toivonen

Riitta Niskanen

Anne Karvinen-Jussilainen

Maria Silvast

Sara Ikävalko

Kari Salmi

Hannu Himanen

Simo Räihä

Susanna Iivonen-Pekesen

Timo Valtonen

Pirjo Huvila

Helka-Liisa Hentilä

Johanna Hyrkäs

Kimmo Sutinen, Competition secretary