

# Jury Report

## European 10 – Ireland – Dublin and Galway



Comhshaol, Oidhreacht agus Rialtas Áitiúil  
Environment, Heritage and Local Government



### Jury:

**Aidan O'Connor**, Principal Advisor, Housing Division, Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government

**Yvonne Farrell**, Grafton Architects

**Marguerite Murphy**, County Architect, Fingal County Council

**John McLaughlin**, Former Director of Architecture, Dublin Docklands Authority

**Theo Dorgan**, Poet

**Alex Ely**, mæ LLP Architects, UK

**Edward Jones**, Dixon Jones Architects, UK

**Gerard Maccreanor**, Maccreanor Lavington Architects, Netherlands

**Neil Baxter**, Secretary and Treasurer, The Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland

### Introduction:

This is the second occasion Ireland has participated in the European Competition. The involvement of the local authorities in both Dublin City and Galway City, in collaboration with the Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland and the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government, indicates our continuing commitment to this exciting European Competition process.

The inherent contradictions that characterize both competition sites, due to their location at the edge of their city, and in the context of either the ambitions of a masterplan or the constraints of a development plan, offered many challenges to the skills of our young architects and resulted in the many innovative approaches.

Sincere thanks must go to the members of our jury for their shared insights and analyses while visiting the sites and during their assessment of the schemes. It was an honour and a pleasure to be in such esteemed company.

**Aidan O'Connor, MRIAI**  
Chair, Ireland Jury European 10

## **Dublin – European 10:**

### **Site**

The site, 0.44ha, is the site of the boiler house of “old” Ballymun. It is situated a short block off the main street through Ballymun. The site will be surrounded on all four sides by streets. There are 5 storey apartments to the south of the site, proposed mixed use development to the north, proposed 5 story office block to the west and proposed 3 storey housing to the east.

### **Brief**

The quantum of the development proposed is 12 residential studios, a workshop, internal and external exhibition spaces and associated facilities and a mixed use residential development in keeping with the master plan prepared for the area.

### **Jury’s general comments on site, brief and proposals**

It was a challenging site for young architects to relate to. In response to the brief a high level of complexity was required of the submissions. Three main typologies were common to all proposals: perimeter block, object buildings and fractured buildings. Many proposals retained the chimney of the boiler-house but some did not fully exploit that potential. The jury considered that the quality of the design proposals did not always reflect the challenges of the brief. The more successful proposals manifested a higher level of understanding of the public realm and how the proposed design solution would relate to the immediate surroundings and the evolving nature of the regeneration area as guided by the Ballymun masterplan.

### **Winner: NW900 – Boilerhouse Art Studios by Ross Lambie (UK)**

This scheme retains the existing boiler house building. It is a type of perimeter block typology. It opens up the courtyard to the east-west counter axis between the park and the main street with subtle gestures seeking to extend its influence to and beyond the surrounding area in a calm and controlled manner. The design solution responds well to the requirements of the brief with clear confident space making, carefully planned clear hierarchy of spaces, well crafted, and articulated welcoming yet defensible space. The tower block on the south west corner compliments the retained chimney. It is a well thought out scheme that is realisable and could be phased as a development.

### **Runner-up: CA111 – Counter-axis by a2 Architects (IE)**

This scheme proposes a very strong counter axis to the strength of the main north south street in Ballymun. The architect has extended the scheme beyond the site by forming a pedestrian space at a high level over the main street. The existing building is retained with the residential elements at a higher level sailing over it. It is a very well thought out scheme but with insufficient overview of the public spaces, with poor connection at street level, and an overwhelming undercroft. This very innovative proposal with an inhabited roof over the site is at a scale of intervention larger than necessary.

### **Dublin: Shortlisted Submissions**

**AE999** The candidate graphically shows a very simple idea of an object building set on the entire site. It is a quiet elegant solution. The section is alive. The exhibition space is much larger than that required in the brief. The juxtaposition of the building and the street would require further work.

**BD028** The candidate has produced an elegant perimeter block typology. It is a very confident scheme. It breaks up the street façade well and is not defensive. Whilst the scheme is porous further work is required on the size of the internal courtyard so that it is not too small for the scheme.

European 10 – Ireland – Dublin and Galway  
Jury Report – Final

- GC084** The candidate strongly embeds his scheme in Ballymun. It is shown in the overall context of Ballymun and bravely extends the scheme beyond the site taking in the surroundings. It does the counter axis to the main street very well and connects the site to the adjacent park whilst giving a meaning to the retained chimney and boilers. It would be a good addition to the regeneration of Ballymun.
- IG911** This is a well presented confident project of the perimeter block typology. The gesture of the external ramp is good but could be improved by using the chimney to descend. There is good movement outside the buildings. The quality of the spaces is good.

**Dublin: Other Entries**

- AS033** The candidate has designed a perimeter scheme. It separates the different functions in the brief. The house plans are much more considered than the studio spaces. The build ability of parts of the scheme would need to be reconsidered.
- BD212** This scheme has an iconic character but displays naivety. It is a light hearted scheme with a fractured typology. The artists' studios and residential units are not thought through.
- BM377** This is a textured scheme. It is a well thought out scheme with good quality drawings. The candidate has made reasonable attempts at perimeter block typology but the centre courtyard is too small for the scheme and would be oppressive.
- CA020** The candidate has designed a very dynamic scheme. The jury was impressed with the very powerful image that was the scheme. There was a very good quality to the presentation. Whilst the image of the art containers piled up under the under-croft of the apartments was fun there were problems with the quality of the public space around the containers.
- CD103** The candidate has designed a perimeter block in response to the brief. The ownership and identity of spaces has been considered. The candidate has acknowledged the need for permeability. The quality of the perimeter block would need to be reconsidered.
- CT320** This scheme recreates the seven towers of Ballymun. It shows a bold architectural concept of slim towers in the context of Ballymun uniting the past and the future. It gives a counter axis on the vertical to the rest of the new Ballymun. The ground floor and the floor plans due to the slenderness of the towers would need to be reconsidered.
- DD043** The candidate has retained the existing building in his proposed scheme. The individual buildings are nicely placed whilst there is ingenuity in the connections of the built forms. The scheme suffers by being over dense.
- DG647** The scheme has a good urban form. It is very legibly presented. The buildings angled to the street act as a filter to the interior of the scheme. The height of the blocks is not in keeping with the proposed heights of the surrounding projects.
- DT062** The candidate has designed a poetic scheme of patterned courtyards and solids. Whilst the candidate states that the fact that most of the ground floor is an under-croft comprising of light shafts and solids and stairs to individual

European 10 – Ireland – Dublin and Galway  
Jury Report – Final

units would make the scheme more porous and open to the adjoining community the jury felt that in practice the space would be very problematic.

- FL111** This is a very brave scheme showing a counter axis to the dominance of the main north / south street through Ballymun. The ramp is a huge gesture but requires to be connected to the main street to give it relevance.
- FT237** This scheme is a perimeter block type scheme in its purest state. The candidate reuses the existing structure on the site. The proposed scheme is restrained and elegant but fails to express its qualities.
- FZ010** The candidate has questioned the master plan and provided for a large urban square acknowledging the fact that the entire site does not have to be covered to provide for the requirements of the brief. The quality of the public space and the building would need to be reconsidered
- GA211** The candidate has proposed a perimeter block. It allows for the social interaction between artists. The proposed scheme lacks structure and would require further work.
- HH029** The candidate has proposed a clear articulation of the different elements. The residential block to the east of the site is reminiscent of the residential blocks to be demolished and questions the existing master plan for Ballymun.
- LC217** The candidate questions whether the current master plan for Ballymun will be completed. It proposes a fractured environment with an urban square but the scheme requires further work.
- LP123** The scheme is a three sided perimeter block. It shows the connection on the northern street between the adjacent park and the main street, giving the chimney a context and showing it as a key icon for the area. It acknowledges the plan for the metro. The scheme would benefit from further work.
- NH444** The candidate has proposed an original scheme based on a perimeter block. It has sculptural qualities with a brave exterior. It is an unusual scheme but not related to Ballymun.
- OK027** The candidate proposes a series of pavilion type structures. They set up a counter geometry within the site. The arts programme is separated from the residential. The scheme requires further work.
- OO000** The candidate proposes a series of pavilion type structures. They set up a counter geometry within the site. The arts programme is separated from the residential. The scheme requires further work.
- PA182** The candidate has proposed a perimeter block typology. The proposed scheme is overly complex with too much emphasis on the circulation route. The proposed elevations are much more assured than the plans.
- PS904** The candidate provided a good analysis of the brief and the site. The scheme has good connections to existing green spaces. It separates the residential from the civic component. More work would be required on the elevations and on how the scheme addresses the surrounding streets.
- RR503** The candidate worked well within the scale of the master plan vision and clearly understood the brief. The proposed project fails in the integration of this project with the wider Ballymun community

- SA197** This scheme argues against the master plan and provides for a large urban square between the proposed buildings and Ballymun main street. It has a very interesting section with a play between the solids and voids. It is a mute point whether the proposed scheme would work in the Irish climate.
- SC969** The candidate designed a very simple perimeter block. The scale is in keeping with the adjoining buildings. The scheme fails in that addressing two of the streets it fails to address the other two.
- ST610** The candidate has proposed a perimeter block scheme. It shows the axis of the chimney with the adjacent public park. The perimeter block is not fully resolved and requires further work.

## **Galway**

### **Site**

The site is on the extreme western boundary of Galway City. The study site was 35.818ha whilst the site owned by Galway City was 3.083nha dividing the centre of the study scheme. The site is extremely exposed and presently is mostly reliant on private transport to access the site.

### **Brief**

The brief pointed out the difficulty of peripheral sites attached to urban conurbations throughout Ireland that are zoned residential and the difficulty of creating an urban form and place making from such sites. The brief required a master plan for the entire area and a detailed plan for the site in the ownership of Galway City.

### **Jury's general comments on site, brief and proposals**

This is an extremely difficult competition brief requiring a master plan and a detailed plan for one particular area. The candidates found the site area too big and most of the schemes were designed for the particular site and were evidently lost in the repeating of the scheme throughout the overall site. It pointed out to the importance of including Urban Design and Master Planning in the training of an architect. A site visit was essential to understand the challenge of the brief. The schemes that challenged the density as laid out in the Development Plan were more successful. The jury were very disappointed with the quality of most submissions that showed a lack of understanding of urban design and place making.

### **Winner: SA010 – Terroir by Conor Sreenan (IE)**

The candidate has given a very good analysis of the site, urban design and house types. The graphics employed to explain the scheme are engaging. There is a strong sense of place in the proposed scheme, the public realm is relaxed and informal, the dwellings are varied in plan and section with strategically located outbuildings establishing opportunities to create communal areas with play spaces and shared facilities for social interaction. The orientation and arrangement of the housing recognises the prevailing winds and creates a pattern of sustainability in the build environment at the edge of the city. The graphics of the presentation playfully communicates the design intention.

### **Runner-up: VX970 – Reviving the Margins by Donal Colfer (IE)**

The candidate has given a very good analysis of the original Irish settlements in the landscape and has given them a modern idiom. The clusters carved into the landscape and environmental strategy is good but could benefit by being of different sizes and configurations. The relationship of roads and parking to the different clusters require further work.

**Galway: Shortlisted Submission**

**ST151** The candidate has proposed a sheltered courtyard housing typology joined together in different configurations in response to the site with a “park” attached to each cluster. The overall plan retains remnants of the original site. The elevations could be improved and the public realm would require further work.

**Galway: Other Entries**

**CF187** The candidate produced an attractive scheme of linear clusters scattered throughout the landscape of the site taking account of the contours of the site. It provided an urban grain but did not show variation in the larger site being too dense for its context.

**DS528** This scheme proposed terraces on a north/ south axis with small parks interspersed providing sustainable design and shelter from the wind. Whilst the proposed scheme showed some merit on the smaller site it lost all meaning on the larger site.

**EC973** The candidate has questioned the Galway Development Plan and the sites residential zoning in providing different enclaves of building types to form different typologies. The graphical style was difficult to decipher the candidate’s intent.

**FX171** The candidate attempted to produce an urban planning scheme with other uses and integrating sustainable elements. The proposal required further work but was inappropriate for the context of the site.

**GY091** The candidate proposed a very linear scheme on a north / south axis proposing sustainable environment but not having any regard or protection for the most environmental part of the site, the west winds. Whilst the proposal was strong on the smaller site it did not offer any variation in the larger scheme.

**IT444** The candidate proposed a very strong grid of court yard housing offering protection from the wind. Whilst the proposal was strong on the smaller site it did not offer any variation in the larger scheme.

**JC033** The candidate rejects the Development Plan and proposes a powerful iconic gesture that is inappropriate for the context of the site location.

**JS977** The proposal preserves much of the site in its existing condition and concentrates the development in part of the site only. it acknowledges the landscape of the site but the proposal requires further work

**KK000** The candidate questions the Development Plan and reduces the proposed density for the site by proposing only building on part of it. The scheme is inappropriate to the context of the site.

**MD007** The candidate shows the context of the site to the sea but fails to bring it into the scheme design. The proposal is for off site construction brought onto the site with grouped south facing courtyard housing providing shelter from the wind. The public / semi private / private areas are unresolved. There is an attempt to create a piece of urban design but the layout is inappropriate to the site location.

**MF610** The candidate has produced an interesting idea of dry stone walling creating a sense of place. The proposal connects with the indigenous

European 10 – Ireland – Dublin and Galway  
Jury Report – Final

character of the area. The proposed scheme extends beyond the site. The proposal requires more work on the relationship of the housing to the streets

- OO227** The candidate displayed an awareness of the typography of the site in designing demountable housing well protected from the wind. The scheme fails in the relationship of the housing to the streets. Whilst the proposal was strong on the smaller site it did not offer the variation in the larger scheme promised in the accompanying booklet.
- RM241** The proposal shows a master plan and concentrates on the study site. The scheme is around a central courtyard with connections to future and existing schemes. Both areas require further work.
- RP060** The candidate has produced house types that are well considered within a scheme that is a counter act to the urban sprawl prevalent in the area. The scheme is over dense for the context of the site
- TA141** The candidate provided a very good analysis of vernacular architecture but did not take it through to the proposed scheme. There were well designed individual units but the overall proposal was inappropriate to the context of the site.